2013 State Teacher Policy Yearbook

New Mexico





Acknowledgments

STATES

State education agencies remain our most important partners in this effort, and their gracious cooperation has helped to ensure the factual accuracy of the final product. Every state formally received a draft of the *Yearbook* in July 2013 for comment and correction; states also received a final draft of their reports a month prior to release. All but two states responded to our inquiries. While states do not always agree with our recommendations, their willingness to engage in dialogue and often acknowledge the imperfections of their teacher policies is an important step forward.

FUNDERS

The primary funders for the 2013 Yearbook were:

Bill and Melinda Gates FoundationCarnegie Corporation of New York

- The Joyce Foundation
- The Walton Family Foundation
- Gleason Family Foundation
- The National Council on Teacher Quality does not accept any direct funding from the federal government.

STAFF

Sandi Jacobs, *Project Director* Adrienne S. Davis, *Project Assistant* Kathryn M. Doherty, *Special Contributor* Kelli Lakis, *Lead Researcher* Stephanie T. Maltz and Lisa N. Staresina, *Researchers* Phil Lasser, *Research Assistant*

Special thanks to Leigh Zimnisky, Brittany Atkinson and Justin Rakowski at CPS Gumpert for their design of the 2013 *Yearbook*. Thanks also to Colleen Hale and Jeff Hale at EFA Solutions for the original *Yearbook* design and ongoing technical support.

National Council on Teacher Quality

Executive Summary

The 2013 *State Teacher Policy Yearbook* includes the National Council on Teacher Quality's (NCTQ) full review of the state laws, rules and regulations that govern the teaching profession. This year's report measures state progress against a set of 31 policy goals focused on helping states put in place a comprehensive framework in support of preparing, retaining and rewarding effective teachers.

New Mexico at a Glance



Overall 2013 Yearbook Grade Overall 2011 Yearbook Grade: D+

Area Grades	2013	2011
Area 1 Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers	D	D+
Area 2 Expanding the Teaching Pool	D-	D-
Area 3 Identifying Effective Teachers	C-	D
Area 4 Retaining Effective Teachers	C-	D+1
Area 5 Exiting Ineffective Teachers	С	С

Goal Breakdown	2013	Progress on Goals
🚖 Best Practice	0	Since 2011
Fully Meets	3	Progress has increased 5
Nearly Meets	3	No change in progress 26
Partially Meets	7	
Meets Only a Small Part	6	Progress has decreased0
O Does Not Meet	12	

¹ State teacher pension policy is no longer included in the State Teacher Policy Yearbook. So that Area 4 grades can be compared, 2011 grades have been recalculated to exclude the pension goals. Overall 2011 grades were not recalculated, as the impact was negligible.

Admission into Teacher Preparation	\bigcirc	Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science	\bigcirc
Elementary Teacher Preparation		Special Education Teacher Preparation	\bigcirc
Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction		Assessing Professional Knowledge	
Teacher Preparation in Mathematics		Student Teaching	
, Middle School Teacher Preparation		Teacher Preparation Program Accountability	\bigcirc
Secondary Teacher Preparation	\bigcup		\bigcirc
Policy Strengths			
Elementary teacher candidates must pass a reading test to ensure knowledge of effectiv instruction.		All new teachers must pass a pedagog	y test.
Policy Weaknesses			
Teacher candidates are not required to pass academic proficiency as a criterion for admis teacher preparation programs.		The state offers a K-12 special educati and does not require any content testi education teacher candidates.	
 Elementary teacher candidates are not required to pass a content test with individually score subtests in each of the core content areas, in mathematics. 	ed	 Requirements for teacher preparation high-quality student teaching experier The teacher preparation program appridoes not hold programs accountable for the teachers they produce 	nce. oval process
 Middle school teachers are allowed to teach generalist license. 	on a K-8	the teachers they produce.	
Although most secondary teachers must pass content test to teach a core subject area, so secondary science and social studies teacher required to pass content tests for each discip are licensed to teach.	me rs are not		
Area 2: Expanding the Pool of	Teach	ers l	Page 51
	Teach	ers F Part-Time Teaching Licenses	Page 51
	Teach		Page 51
Alternate Route Eligibility Alternate Route Preparation	Teach	Part-Time Teaching Licenses	Page 51
Alternate Route Eligibility Alternate Route Preparation Alternate Route Usage and Providers	Teach	Part-Time Teaching Licenses	Page 51
Alternate Route Eligibility Alternate Route Preparation		Part-Time Teaching Licenses Licensure Reciprocity The state does not offer a license with requirements that would allow conten	minimal
Alternate Route Eligibility Alternate Route Preparation Alternate Route Usage and Providers Policy Weaknesses There are no admission requirements outline	ed for icient	Part-Time Teaching Licenses Licensure Reciprocity The state does not offer a license with	minimal t experts to I to meet the are additional

How is **New Mexico** Faring?



Figure A	Overall State Grade 2013	Overall State Grade 2017	Overall _{State} Grade 2009
Florida	B+	В	С
Louisiana	В	C-	C-
Rhode Island	B	B-	D
Tennessee	В	B-	C-
Arkansas	B-	C	C-
Connecticut	B-	C-	D+
Georgia	B-	C	C-
Indiana	B-	C+	D
Massachusetts	B-	C	D+
Michigan	B-	C+	D-
New Jersey	B-	D+	D+
New York	B-	С	D+
Ohio	B-	C+	D+
Oklahoma	B-	B-	D+
Colorado	C+	С	D+
Delaware	C+	С	D
Illinois	C+	С	D+
Virginia	C+	D+	D+
Kentucky	С	D+	D+
Mississippi	С	D+	D+
North Carolina	С	D+	D+
Utah	С	C-	D
Alabama	C-	C-	C-
Arizona	C-	D+	D+
Maine	C-	D-	F
Minnesota	C-	C-	D-
Missouri	C-	D	D
Nevada	C-	C-	D-
Pennsylvania	C-	D+	D
South Carolina	C-	C-	C-
Texas	C-	C-	C-
Washington	C-	C-	D+
West Virginia	C-	D+	D+
California	D+	D+	D+
District of Columbia	D+	D	D-
Hawaii	D+	D-	D-
Idaho	D+	D+	D-
Maryland	D+	D+	D
NEW MEXICO	D+	D+	D+
Wisconsin	D+	D	D
Alaska	D	D	D
lowa	D	D	D
Kansas	D	D	D-
New Hampshire	D	D-	D-
North Dakota	D	D	D-
Oregon	D	D-	D-
Wyoming	D	D	D-
Nebraska	D-	D-	D-
South Dakota	D-	D	D
Vermont	D-	D-	F
Montana	F	F	F

How to Read the Yearbook

GOAL SCORE

The extent to which each goal has been met:

*	Best Practice
	Fully Meets
	Nearly Meets
	Partially Meets
	Meets Only a Small Part
\bigcirc	Does Not Meet

PROGRESS INDICATOR

Whether the state has advanced on the goal, policy has remained unchanged or the state has lost ground on that topic:

\mathbf{O}	Goal progress has increased since 2011
\bigcirc	Goal progress has decreased since 2011
Ð	Goal progress has remained the same since 2011

BAR RAISED FOR THIS GOAL *Indicates the criteria to meet the goal have been raised since the 2011* Yearbook.

READING CHARTS AND TABLES:

Strong practices or the ideal policy positions for the states are capitalized:





Area 1 Summary

How States are Faring on Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

State Area Grades



Topics Included In This Area

- 1-A: Admission into Teacher Preparation
- **1-B:** Elementary Teacher Preparation
- 1-C: Elementary Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction
- 1-D: Elementary Teacher Preparation in Mathematics
- 1-E: Middle School Teacher Preparation

- 1-F: Secondary Teacher Preparation
- 1-G: Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science
- 1-H: Special Education Teacher Preparation
- 1-I: Assessing Professional Knowledge
- 1-J: Student Teaching
- 1-K: Teacher Preparation Program Accountability

Goal A – Admission into Teacher Preparation

The state should require teacher preparation programs to admit only candidates with strong academic records.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should require teacher candidates to pass a test of academic proficiency that assesses reading, writing and mathematics skills as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation programs.
- 2. All preparation programs in a state should use a common admissions test to facilitate program comparison, and the test should allow comparison of applicants to the general college-going population. The selection of applicants should be limited to the top half of that population.

The components for this goal have changed since 2011. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 1

How States are Faring in Admission Requirements

Best Practice States 2 Delaware¹, Rhode Island¹ State Meets Goal Texas States Nearly Meet Goal Mississippi¹, New Jersey¹, Utah¹ 11 States Partly Meet Goal Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kentucky¹, North Carolina, South Carolina¹, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin 13 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alabama 1, Arkansas, Florida, Illinois 1, Iowa, Louisiana, Michigan 1, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire 1, Oklahoma 1, Oregon 1, Pennsylvania 21 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, NEW MEXICO, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 12:12 ⇔:38 1:1

1-A Analysis: New Mexico

State Does Not Meet Goal

💦 Bar Raised for this Goal 🛛 🔶 Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico does not require prospective teachers to pass a test of academic proficiency as a criterion for admission to teacher preparation programs. Rather, the basic skills assessment requirement is delayed until teacher candidates are ready to apply for licensure.

Supporting Research New Mexico Administrative Code 6.65.2.8

RECOMMENDATION

Require that teacher preparation programs screen candidates for academic proficiency prior to admission.

Teacher preparation programs that do not screen candidates invest considerable resources in individuals who may not be able to successfully complete the program and pass licensing tests. Candidates in need of additional support should complete remediation before entering the program to avoid the possibility of an unsuccessful investment of significant public tax dollars. New Mexico should require candidates to pass a test of academic proficiency that assesses reading, mathematics and writing prior to program admission.

Require that programs use a common admissions test normed to the general college-bound population.

New Mexico should require programs to use an assessment that demonstrates that candidates are academically competitive with all peers, regardless of their intended profession. Requiring a common test normed to the general college population would allow for the selection of applicants in the top half of their class while also facilitating program comparison.

Consider requiring candidates to pass subject-matter tests as a condition of admission into teacher programs.

In addition to ensuring that programs require a measure of academic performance for admission, New Mexico might also want to consider requiring content testing prior to program admission as opposed to at the point of program completion. Program candidates are likely to have completed coursework that covers related test content in the prerequisite classes required for program admission. Thus, it would be sensible to have candidates take content tests while this knowledge is fresh rather than wait two years to fulfill the requirement, and candidates lacking sufficient expertise would be able to remedy deficits prior to entering formal preparation.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

For admission to teacher preparation programs, **Rhode Island** and **Delaware** require a test of academic proficiency normed to the general collegebound population rather than a test that is normed just to prospective teachers. Delaware also requires teacher candidates to have a 3.0 GPA or be in the top 50th percentile for general education coursework completed. Rhode Island also requires an average cohort GPA of 3.0, and beginning in 2016, the cohort mean score on nationally-normed tests such as the ACT, SAT or GRE must be in the top 50th percentile. In 2020, the requirement for the mean test score will increase from the top half to the top third.

Figure 2

Do states require an assessment of academic proficiency that is normed to the general college-going population?



1. Strong Practice: Delaware, Rhode Island, Texas

2. Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin

3. Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Ohio, South Dakota, Wyoming

Figure 3

When do states test teacher candidates' academic proficiency?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- Alaska, California, District of Columbia, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Vermont

3. Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Ohio, South Dakota, Wyoming

Figure 4 Do states measure the academic proficiency of beacher candidates? Image: Constant of the states measure the academic proficiency of beacher candidates? Alabama Image: Constant of the states measure the academic proficiency of beacher candidates? Image: Constant of the states measure the academic proficiency of the states measure the academic profile					
Alaska	Figure 4		4.25/		1.1
Alaska	Destation			Ę	" afte
Alaska	Do states measure the	5	P PRC	rogr	ache Ting o Progra
Alaska	academic proficiency of	E 4	LAT PRE It of		d leg
Alaska	teacher candidates?	POP	NN I		n of h
Alaska		222	ission St nc didan	st no	oletio
Alaska	,	# 0 A	ad a real		No t
Alaska	Alabama				
Arizona	Alaska				
Arkansas Image: Construct im					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia Image: Construct of the second s					
Havaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Idana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Imaine Maryland Maryland Maryland Michigan Michigan Michigan Mississippi Mississippi Montana Nebraska New Jarsey New Jarsey New Jarsey New KICO New York North Carolina Ohio Ohio Ohio Ohio Oklahoma Indiana Indiana Intersee					
Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Iowa Iowa Iowa Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Imaine Maryland Imassachusetts Michigan Michigan Mississippi Mississippi Montana Nebraska New Jarsey New Jarsey New Jersey New KICO New York North Carolina Ohio Ohio Ohio Ohio Ohio Ohio Ohio Imasse Image	-				
Illinois Illinois Indiana Indiana Iowa Indiana Iowa Indiana Iowa Indiana Kansas Indiana Maine Indiana Maine Indiana Maryland Indiana Massachusetts Indiana Mississippi Indiana Missouri Indiana Missouri Indiana Nebraska Indiana Nevada Indiana New Hampshire Indiana New York Indiana New York Indiana North Carolina Indiana North Dakota Indiana Origon Indiana Pennsylvania Indiana Rhode Island Indiana South Carolina Indiana					
Indiana Image: Sector of the sector of t					
IowaImage: Constraint of the second seco					
Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississispi Missouri Montana Nebraska Newda New Hampshire New Jersey Net MEXICO New York North Carolina Ohio Oklahoma Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Ital Ital Virginia Washington Wisconsin Wyoming					
Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississispi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey Net MEXICO New York North Carolina Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Ital Ital Ital Ital Washington Wisconsin Wyoming					
LouisianaMaineMarylandMassachusettsMichiganMinnesotaMississippiMissouriMontanaNebraskaNew AdaNew HampshireNew JerseyNew YorkNorth CarolinaOhioOklahomaOklahomaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaVermontYirginiaWashingtonWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyomingWyoming					
MaineMarylandMassachusettsMichiganMinnesotaMinnesotaMississippiMissouriMontanaNebraskaNevadaNew HampshireNew JerseyNew YorkNorth CarolinaOhioOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeTexasVermontVirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWyoming	-				
Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New York New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Carolina South Carolina Washington Washington Wisconsin Wyoming					
MassachusettsImage: Image:	Maryland				
Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New MEXICO New York New York North Carolina North Dakota Oregon Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Carolina Image: South Carolina South Carolina Image: South Carolina Vermont Vermont Virginia Washington Wisconsin Wyoming					
Minnesota Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nebraska Nevada New Ada New Hampshire New Jersey New York New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Carolina Image: South Carolina Vermont Vermont Virginia Washington Wisconsin Wyoming	Michigan				
Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New York New York New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington Wisconsin Wyoming	-				
MontanaNebraskaNevadaNew daNew HampshireNew JerseyNEW MEXICONew YorkNorth CarolinaNorth CarolinaNorth DakotaOhioOklahomaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTexasVermontVermontVirginiaWashingtonWashingtonWyoming	Mississippi				
Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New York New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Carolina Image: South Carolina Vermont Vermont Vermont Virginia Washington Wisconsin Wyoming	Missouri				
Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey NEW MEXICO New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Carolina Image: South Carolina Vermont Vermont Virginia Washington Wisconsin Wyoming	Montana				
New Hampshire New Jersey New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming	Nebraska				
New JerseyImage: Constraint of the second secon	Nevada				
NEW MEXICO Image: Constraint of the second seco	New Hampshire				
New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Itah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming	New Jersey				
North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Itah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming	NEW MEXICO				
North DakotaOhioOklahomaOregonOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeItanaTexasUtahVermontVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWisconsinWyoming					
Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Image: South Carolina South Dakota Image: South Carolina South Carolina South Carolina Image: South C	North Carolina				
Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Tennessee Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming					
OregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth DakotaTennesseeImage: Search of the se					
Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming			1		
Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wisconsin Utah					
Texas Utah Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming					
Utah Comment of the second sec					
Vermont					
Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming					
Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming					
West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming	-				
Wisconsin Image: Construct of the second	_				
Wyoming	_				
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
3 26 14 8	wyonning				
		3	26	14	8

1. Candidates in Oklahoma also have the option of gaining admission with a 3.0 GPA.

Do states require a minimum GPA for admission to teacher prep?



1. Strong Practice: Delaware, Mississippi⁶, New Jersey⁶, Oklahoma⁷, Pennsylvania⁸, Rhode Island⁶, Utah

3. Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut⁹, Florida, Georgia, Michigan, South Carolina, South Dakota, Wisconsin¹⁰

4. Louisiana

- 5. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 6. The 3.0 GPA requirement is a cohort average; individual candidates must have a 2.75 GPA.
- 7. Candidates in Oklahoma also have the option of gaining admission by passing a basic skills test.
- 8. Students can also be admitted with a combination of a 2.8 GPA and qualifying scores on the basic skills test or SAT/ACT.

9. Connecticut requires a B- grade point average for all undergraduate courses.

10. The GPA admission requirement is 2.5 for undergraduate and 2.75 for graduate programs.

^{2.} Kentucky, Texas

Goal B – Elementary Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that its teacher preparation programs provide elementary teachers with a broad liberal arts education, providing the necessary foundation for teaching to the Common Core or similar state standards.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should require all elementary teacher candidates, including those who can teach elementary grades on an early childhood license, to pass a subject-matter test designed to ensure sufficient content knowledge of all core subjects.
- 2. The state should require that its approved teacher preparation programs deliver a comprehensive program of study in broad liberal arts coursework. An adequate curriculum is likely to require approximately 36 credit hours to ensure appropriate depth in the core subject areas of English, science, social studies and fine arts. (*Mathematics preparation for elementary teachers is discussed in Goal 1-D*.)
- 3. The state should require elementary teacher candidates to complete a content specialization in an academic subject area. In addition to enhancing content knowledge, this requirement ensures that prospective teachers have taken higher level academic coursework.



The components for this goal have changed since 2011. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 6

How States are Faring in Elementary Teacher Preparation



 Best Practice State Indiana
 States Meet Goal

- States Meet Goal Connecticut¹, New Hampshire¹
- 11 States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama 1, Arkansas 1, District of Columbia 1, Florida 1, Idaho 1, Kentucky 1, New Jersey 1, Rhode Island 1, Texas 1, Utah 1, Virginia 1
- 1

14 States Partly Meet Goal California, Delaware , Georgia, Maine , Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York , North Carolina , Oklahoma, Oregon , Pennsylvania , South Carolina , Vermont , West Virginia

5 St. Ari

States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona 1, Colorado, Mississippi, NEW MEXICO, Washington

18 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, Ohio¹, South Dakota, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

1:24 ↔:27 ↓:0

1-B Analysis: New Mexico

State Meets a Small Part of Goal 🔿 Bar Raised for this Goal 😝 Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico has adopted the Common Core State Standards, which represent an effort to significantly raise the standards for the knowledge and skills American students will need for college readiness and global competitiveness. However, the state does not ensure that its early childhood teacher candidates are adequately prepared to teach the rigorous content associated with these standards.

New Mexico requires candidates to pass the New Mexico Teacher Assessments (NMTA) general elementary content test, which does not report teacher performance in each subject area, meaning that it may be possible to pass the test and still fail some subject areas.

Early childhood education teacher candidates in New Mexico, who are allowed to teach up through grade 3, are not required to pass a content test.

In addition, teacher candidates must complete the following coursework:

- 12 credit hours of English;
- 12 credit hours of history, including American history and Western civilization;
- 6 credit hours of government, economics or sociology;
- 12 credit hours of science, including biology, chemistry, physics, geology, zoology or botany; and
- 6 credit hours of fine arts. (For math requirements, see Goal 1-D.)

Elementary teacher candidates in New Mexico must complete an additional 24 to 36 credit hours of coursework in a specific teaching field.

Supporting Research New Mexico Teacher Assessments www.nmta.nesinc.com New Mexico Administrative Code 6.61.2.8, -.10 Adding an Endorsement http://www.ped.state.nm.us/licensure/2010/dl10/resENDORSEMENT%20AREAS.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

Require all elementary teacher candidates—including candidates for an early childhood license—to pass a subject-matter test designed to ensure sufficient content knowledge of all subjects.

New Mexico should require both a rigorous content test as a condition of certification and separate, meaningful passing scores for each area on the test. Use of a composite passing score offers no assurance of adequate knowledge in each subject area. A candidate may achieve a passing score and still be seriously deficient in a particular subject area.

New Mexico is urged to require all early childhood education teacher candidates who teach elementary grades to pass an appropriate test, either the same test as other elementary teachers or a comparably rigorous one geared to early childhood content. It is especially worrisome that the state allows teachers up through grade 3 to teach without ever having passed a content test

Ensure that teacher preparation programs deliver a comprehensive program of study in broad liberal arts coursework.

Although New Mexico outlines a more specific set of content standards than most states, the state should either articulate an even more specific set of standards or establish comprehensive coursework requirements that are specifically geared to the areas of knowledge needed by PK-6 teachers. Further, the state should align its requirements for elementary teacher candidates with the Common Core State Standards to ensure that candidates will complete coursework relevant to the common topics in elementary grades. An adequate curriculum is likely to require approximately 36 credit hours in the core subject areas of English, science, social studies and fine arts. New Mexico articulates elementary content knowledge standards that are better than those found in many states and allude to important areas of academic knowledge. For example, in the area of science, candidates must "know, understand and use the fundamental concepts in science and technology, science in personal and social perspectives, the history and nature of science, the unifying concepts of science, and the inquiry process scientists use in discovery of new knowledge to build a base for scientific inquiry." However, the standards still lack specific mention of important areas such as English and fine arts, as well as nonWestern world history.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. The state also noted that in 2014, the early childhood license will be separated into two licenses: birth to age 5 and age 4 to grade 3.

Figure 7 Do states ensure that elementary teachers know core content? Image: Content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content? Alabama Image: Content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content? Image: Content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content? Alabama Image: Content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content? Image: Content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content? Alabama Image: Content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content? Image: Content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know core content of the states ensure that elementary teachers know teach					
Arizona	Figure 7		DNINC /	with	with
Arizona	Do states ensure that	ENT.	PASS IECT	Te fo	100
Arizona	elementary teachers	LNO A	SUB SUB	o soc	P
Arizona	know core content?	SEPA		Cor.	quire
Arizona		MITH WITH	Tent; ate	entar Site	est re
Arizona		ORE TEL	Eler, Separ	Elem, ompo	No ti
Arizona	Alabama	چ ا	/ s/		
Arkansas Image: California Image: California Colorado Image: California Image: California Connecticut Image: California Image: California Delaware Image: California Image: California District of Columbia Image: California Image: California Florida Image: California Image: California Georgia Image: California Image: California Hawaii Image: California Image: California Idaho Image: California Image: California Illinois Image: California Image: California Indiana Image: California Image: California Indina Image: California	Alaska				1
California	Arizona				
Colorado	Arkansas				
ConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIldinoisIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMarylandMinnesotaMississippiMissouriMontanaNew JerseyNew JerseyNew YorkNew YorkNew YorkNorth DakotaOhioOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaWashingtonWermontWest VirginiaWest VirginiaWest VirginiaWest VirginiaWisconsinWyomingWyoming					
Delaware Image: Control of Columbia Image: Control of Columbia Florida Image: Control of Columbia Image: Control of Columbia Florida Image: Control of Columbia Image: Control of Columbia Idaho Image: Control of Columbia Image: Control of Columbia Idaho Image: Control of Columbia Image: Control of Columbia Idaho Image: Control of Columbia Image: Control of Columbia Idaho Image: Control of Columbia Image: Control of Columbia Idaho Image: Control of Columbia Image: Control of Columbia Idaho Image: Control of Columbia Image: Control of Columbia Idaho Image: Control of Contro					
District of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIdahoIllinoisIndianaIndianaIowaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisianaMaineMaylandMassachusettsMississippiMissouriMontanaNew JarseyNew JerseyNew YorkNorth CarolinaOregonPennsylvaniaRhode IslandSouth CarolinaSouth CarolinaVermontVirginiaWashingtonWest VirginiaWashingtonWisconsinWyomingWyoming					
Florida Image: State of the state of					
Georgia Image: Construct of the second s					
Havaii Image: Second secon					
Illinois Indiana Iowa Indiana Iowa Indiana Iowa Indiana Iowa Indiana Kansas Indiana Kansas Indiana Kansas Indiana Kansas Indiana Louisiana Indiana Maryland Indiana Minnesota Indiana Minnesota Indiana Minnesota Indiana Minnesota Indiana Missouri Indiana Montana Indiana Nevada Indiana Nevada Indiana New Jersey Indiana New Marylania Indiana North Carolina Indiana North Dakota Indiana Oregon Indiana <td>Ū</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Ū				
Indiana Image: Second seco	Idaho				
Iowa Iowa Kansas Iowa Kentucky Iowa Louisiana Iowa Maine Iowa Maine Iowa Maryland Iowa Maryland Iowa Maryland Iowa Massachusetts Iowa Michigan Iowa Mississippi Iowa Missouri Iowa Montana Iowa Nebraska Iowa New Hampshire Iowa New Hampshire Iowa New York Iowa North Carolina Iowa North Dakota Iowa Ohio Iowa Ohio Iowa Oregon Iowa Pennsylvania Iowa Rhode Island Iowa South Dakota Iowa Vermont Iowa Virginia Iowa Washington Iowa West Virginia Iowa Wisconsin Iowa					
Kansas Image: Second Secon					
Kentucky					
Louisiana Imaine Imaine Maine Imaine Imaine Maryland Imaine Imaine Massachusetts Imaine Imaine Minnesota Imaine Imaine Minnesota Imaine Imaine Minnesota Imaine Imaine Mississippi Imaine Imaine Missouri Imaine Imaine Montana Imaine Imaine Nebraska Imaine Imaine New Jacka Imaine Imaine New Jersey Imaine Imaine New York Imaine Imaine New York Imaine Imaine New York Imaine Imaine North Dakota Imaine Imaine Ohio Imaine Imaine Ohio Imaine Imaine Oregon Imaine Imaine Pennsylvania Imaine Imaine South Carolina Imaine Imaine South Dakota Imaine Imaine					
Maine Image: Constraint of the second of	-				
Maryland2Massachusetts3Michigan1Minnesota1Mississippi1Missouri1Montana1Nebraska1Nevada2New Hampshire1New Jersey1New York1North Carolina3North Dakota1Ohio1Ohio1Oregon1South Carolina1South Carolina1South Carolina1Washington1Virginia1Vermont1Virginia1West Virginia1Wisconsin1Wyoming1Wyoming1					
Massachusetts 3 Michigan 1 Minnesota 1 Mississippi 1 Missouri 1 Montana 1 Nebraska 1 Nevada 2 New Hampshire 1 New Jersey 1 New York 1 New York 1 North Carolina 3 North Dakota 1 Ohio 1 Oregon 1 Pennsylvania 1 Rhode Island 1 South Carolina 1 South Dakota 1 Vermont 1 Virginia 1 Washington 1 Wisconsin 1 Wyoming 1				2 ²	
Minnesota Image: Sissippi definition of the second	-			3	
Mississippi Image: Constraint of the second of the sec	Michigan				
Missouri Image: Constraint of the second					
Montana Nebraska Nevada Nev Hampshire New Hampshire New Jersey NEW MEXICO New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Carolina Iteration South Carolina Iteration Virginia Vermont Virginia Washington Wisconsin Wyoming					
Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Ohio Ohio Ohio Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Carolina Tennessee Texas Utah Virginia Washington Wisconsin Wyoming					
Nevada 2 New Hampshire 3 New Jersey 1 NEW MEXICO 1 New York 1 North Carolina 3 North Dakota 1 Ohio 1 Ohio 1 Ohio 1 Oregon 1 Pennsylvania 1 Rhode Island 1 South Carolina 1 South Carolina 1 South Carolina 1 Vermont 1 Vermont 1 Virginia 1 Washington 1 Wisconsin 1 Wyoming 1					
New Hampshire New Jersey NEW MEXICO New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio New York New York North Dakota Image: South Carolina South Carolina Image: South Carolina<				2	
New Jersey NEW MEXICO New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Ohio Ohio Ohio Ohio Ohio Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Carolina South Carolina South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington Wisconsin Wyoming					
New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Ohio Ohio Ohio Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming					
North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming	NEW MEXICO				
North Dakota Ohio Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming					
Ohio Image: Constraint of the second s				3	
Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming					
Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Image: South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming					4
Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming					
Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming					
South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming					
Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming	South Carolina				
Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming	South Dakota				
Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming	Tennessee				
Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming					
Virginia Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming					
Washington Image: Constraint of the second					
West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming					
Wisconsin Wyoming	-				
Wyoming	-				
19 9 19 4	Wyoming				
		19	9	19	4

EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE

Indiana ensures that all candidates licensed to teach the elementary grades possess the requisite subjectmatter knowledge before entering the classroom. Not only are elementary teacher candidates required to pass a content test comprised of independently scored subtests, but the state also requires its early childhood education teachers-who are licensed to teach up through grade 3-to pass a content test comprised of four subtests. Elementary teacher candidates in Indiana must also earn either a major or minor in an academic content area.

1. Alaska does not require testing for initial licensure.

- 2. The required test is a questionable assessment of content knowledge, instead emphasizing methods and instructional strategies.
- 3. Massachusetts and North Carolina require a general curriculum test that does not report scores for each elementary subject. A separate score is reported for math.

4. Only teachers of grades 4 and 5 are required to pass content test.

Do states require early teach elementary grades to pass a content knowledge test?

Do states require early	E				
childhood teachers who		ţ;			
teach elementary grade	es ES	core	i fite	ired .	'bleı
to pass a content	LB JE	int te site s	vith,	, ledi	Pplica
knowledge test?	0 2 8 2 8 2 8 2 8 2 8 2 8 2 8 2 8 2 8 2	Content test with composite score	no no	o tes	Not applicable,
5	CONTENT 75 0 SUBSCORES FOR EACH SUBJECTOR	Content test with composite score	Test with little to no content	No test required	
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
NEW MEXICO					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma		Ц		Ц	
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island	2				
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah	2				
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	6	12	16	4	13

1. These states do not offer a standalone early childhood certification that includes elementary grades or the state's early childhood certification is the de facto license to teach elementary grades.

2. May pass either multiple subjects (subscores) or content knowledge (no subscores) test.

Figure 9		ENGLISH	/	SCIENCE		SOCIAL STUDIES	/ FINE ARTS
Do states expect		Writing Lifeature Composition Children's Lifeature Children's Lifeature		Earth Science Biology/Life Science	/	American History / American History / World History (Ancient) World History (Modern) Mond History	
elementary teachers	American Literature World L	Writing Literature Composition Children's Literature	eun,	Earth Science Biology/Life Science	ey /	American History / American History // World History (Ancie World History (Mode (Non-Westery)	
to have in-depth	itera	sh Lin in Tranu in Litera		Scii Ce		Histo Jove fory	
knowledge of	Cam L	Briti	tes s	al Ph Scien WLift		List List	aphy a
core content?	orta	Writh Omp	Ghemistry Physics Gen	^{Earth} Science Biology/Life Sci _i	mer	American History American History World History (An World History (Mr World History (Mr (Non-Western)	Ceegeaphy Art History Music
	Z / Z				र _		_ (
Alabama Alaska							
Arizona				•			
Arkansas							
California				• 🕁 🕁	-	* * * * •	
Colorado				<u> </u>	$\hat{\Box}$		
Connecticut					*		
Delaware		\star		* *	*	* * *	
District of Columbia		🚖 🗆	🗆 🚖 🗖	* *	*	* * *	
Florida		* 🗆	* 🗆 ★	* *		🔳 ★ 🗆 🔳 🗯	
Georgia		*	🗌 🔲 🜟	* *	*	* * 🗆 🔳 🗆 🔺	
Hawaii							
Idaho		*	- 🗆 ★ 🔳	* *	*	* * * 🗆 🗆 🗖	
Illinois		*		* *			
Indiana		*		* *			
lowa							
Kansas		* *		* *			
Kentucky							
Louisiana Maine							
Maryland							
Massachusetts							
Michigan		* *		🚽 🚽			
Minnesota		* *	🗌 🗙 🚡	- 			
Mississippi		ââ					
Missouri		* 🗆	□ ★ ★	* *	*		
Montana							
Nebraska		* 🗆					
Nevada							
New Hampshire							
New Jersey							
NEW MEXICO		*					
New York							
North Carolina							
North Dakota Ohio							
Oklahoma		*		* *			
Oregon		÷ 🗆		÷÷	*		
Pennsylvania				* *	*		
Rhode Island		$\hat{\star}$		÷ ÷	÷		
South Carolina							
South Dakota							
Tennessee		*	🗌 \star ★	* *		🔲 ★ 🔲 🔲 🗆 🖈	
Texas		*	🗌 \star ★	* *	*	* * 🔳 🔲 🗆 🔺	
Utah		*	🗌 ★ 🔳	* *	- ★	* * * 🗆 🗆 🗖	
Vermont		*					
Virginia		*	*	* *	*	* * * * *	
Washington		*		* *			
West Virginia							
Wisconsin		*		* *	*		
Wyoming							
						Subject mentioned	Subject covered in depth
							Subject covered in depth

What subjects does New Mexico expect elementary teachers to know?



Figure 11

Do states expect elementary teachers to complete an academic concentration?



1. Strong Practice: Colorado, Massachusetts, New Mexico

2. Strong Practice: Indiana, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Oklahoma

3. California, Connecticut, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia

These states require a major, minor or concentration but there is no assurance it will be in an academic subject area.

4. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Goal C – Elementary Teacher Preparation in **Reading Instruction**

The state should ensure that new elementary teachers know the science of reading instruction.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require that new elementary teachers, including those who can teach elementary grades on an early childhood license, pass a rigorous test of reading instruction in order to attain licensure. The design of the test should ensure that prospective teachers cannot pass without knowing the five instructional components shown by scientifically based reading research to be essential to teaching children to read.
- 2. The state should require that teacher preparation programs prepare candidates in the science of reading instruction.

The components for this goal have changed since 2011. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy





ANALYSIS

All elementary teachers in New Mexico are now required to pass the Essential Components of Elementary Reading Instruction test as a condition of initial licensure. This test addresses all five instructional components of scientifically based reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension.

Regrettably, New Mexico does not require its early childhood education teacher candidates, who are allowed to teach up through grade 3, to pass the science of reading assessment.

Supporting Research

NES Test Requirements http://www.nestest.com/PageView.aspx?f=GEN_NewMexico.html

RECOMMENDATION

Require early childhood education teacher candidates to pass a rigorous assessment in the science of reading instruction.

New Mexico should require its early childhood education teacher candidates who teach the elementary grades to be adequately prepared in the science of reading instruction before entering the classroom. Therefore, the state should require the teacher candidates to earn a passing score on the same reading assessment it requires of its elementary education teacher candidates. Early childhood education teachers who teach the elementary grades but do not possess the minimum knowledge in this area should not be eligible for licensure.

Ensure that the science of reading test is meaningful.

To ensure that its science of reading test is meaningful, New Mexico should evaluate its passing score to make certain it reflects a high standard of performance.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 13		PARATIO UIREMEN	TS /	TEST REQUIRE	
Do states ensure that elementary teachers know the science of reading?	FULLY ADDRESS READINC SCIENCE	Do not address reading science	APPROPRIA.	Inadequate for	No reading test
Alabama			1		
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota					
Mississippi Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
NEW MEXICO					
New York					
North Carolina			2		
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Fifteen states meet this goal by requiring that all candidates licensed to teach the elementary grades pass comprehensive assessments that specifically test the five elements of scientifically based reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Independent reviews of the assessments used by **Connecticut** and **Massachusetts**, confirm that these tests are rigorous measures of teacher candidates' knowledge of scientifically based reading instruction.

Alabama's reading test spans the K-12 spectrum.
 Teachers have until their second year to pass the reading test.

Do states measure new elementary teachers' knowledge of the science of reading?



- Strong Practice: Alabama⁴, California, Connecticut, Florida, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina⁵, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Maine, New Jersey, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont
- Alaska, Colorado, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington, Wyoming
- 4. Alabama's reading test spans the K-12 spectrum.
- 5. Teachers have until their second year to pass the reading test.

Figure 15

Do states measure knowledge of the science of reading for early childhood teachers who can teach elementary grades?



- Strong Practice: Alabama⁵, Connecticut, Florida, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin
- 2. Idaho
- Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, Wyoming
- 4. Alaska, Arkansas, California, Georgia, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas These states do not offer a standalone early childhood certification that includes elementary grades or the state's early childhood certification is the de facto license to teach elementary grades.
- 5. Alabama's reading test spans the K-12 spectrum

Goal D – Elementary Teacher Preparation in Mathematics

The state should ensure that new elementary teachers have sufficient knowledge of the mathematics content taught in elementary grades.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should require teacher preparation programs to deliver mathematics content of appropriate breadth and depth to elementary teacher candidates. This content should be specific to the needs of the elementary teacher (i.e., foundations, algebra and geometry with some statistics).
- 2. The state should require elementary teacher candidates, including those who can teach elementary grades on an early childhood license, to pass a rigorous test of mathematics content in order to attain licensure.
- Such test can also be used to test out of course requirements and should be designed to ensure that prospective teachers cannot pass without sufficient knowledge of mathematics.

The components for this goal have changed since 2011. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 16 How States are Faring in Teacher Preparation in Mathematics **Best Practice States** States Meet Goal Arkansas 1, Florida 1, Indiana, Kentucky 1, New York 1, North Carolina 1, Texas 1, Virginia 1 15 States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama¹, Connecticut¹, Delaware¹, District of Columbia 1, Idaho 1, Maine 1, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire 1, New Jersey 1, Rhode Island 1, South Carolina 1, Utah, Vermont 1, West Virginia 1 State Partly Meets Goal California 21 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alaska, Arizona, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, NEW MEXICO, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon 1, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, Wyoming 6 States Do Not Meet Goal Colorado, Hawaii I, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, Wisconsin **Progress on this Goal Since 2011:** ★:20 ↔:30 4:1

1-D Analysis: New Mexico

🖢 State Meets a Small Part of Goal 🛛 🔿 Bar Raised for this Goal 🛛 🛞 Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico requires all new elementary teachers to pass a general elementary subject-matter test, the New Mexico Teacher Assessments (NMTA). The state posts only a limited number of sample items, and a review of this material calls the rigor of its test into question—for example, the test items representing elementary school content assess understanding at too superficial a level. Further, the state's test does not provide a specific mathematics passing score, and therefore, it may be possible to fail the mathematics portion and still pass the test.

Regrettably, New Mexico's early childhood education teachers, who are allowed to teach through grade 3, are not required to pass a content test.

Although elementary teaching candidates must earn at least nine semester hours of credit in mathematics, the state specifies neither the requisite content of these classes nor that they must meet the needs of elementary teachers. New Mexico has also articulated teaching standards that its approved teacher preparation programs must use to frame instruction in elementary mathematics content. These standards outline key areas in mathematics, such as two- and three-dimensional geometry and "elements of algebra including elementary functions." However, these standards lack the specificity needed to ensure that teacher preparation programs deliver mathematics content of appropriate breadth and depth to elementary teacher candidates.

Supporting Research NMTA Test Requirement www.nmta.nesinc.com New Mexico Administrative Code 6.61.2.8 and 6.61.2.10

RECOMMENDATION

Require all teacher candidates who teach elementary grades to pass a rigorous mathematics assessment.

New Mexico should assess mathematics content with a rigorous assessment tool, such as the test required in Massachusetts that evaluates mathematics knowledge beyond an elementary school level and challenges candidates' understanding of underlying mathematics concepts. Such a test could also be used to allow candidates to test out of coursework requirements. Teacher candidates who lack minimum mathematics knowledge should not be eligible for licensure.

Require teacher preparation programs to provide mathematics content specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers.

New Mexico must ensure that new teachers are prepared to teach the mathematics content required by the Common Core State Standards. Although New Mexico requires knowledge in some key areas of mathematics, the state should require teacher preparation programs to provide mathematics content specifically geared to the needs of elementary teachers. This includes specific coursework in foundations, algebra and geometry, with some statistics coursework.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Eight states meet this goal by requiring that all candidates licensed to teach the elementary grades earn a passing score on an independently scored mathematics subtest. **Massachusetts's** MTEL mathematics subtest continues to set the standard in this area by evaluating mathematics knowledge beyond an elementary school level and challenging candidates' understanding of underlying mathematics concepts.

Figure 17

Do states measure new elementary teachers' knowledge of math?



 Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas⁴, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia

 Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming

- 3. Alaska⁵, Hawaii, Montana, Ohio⁶
- 4. Test is not yet available for review.
- 5. Testing is not required for initial licensure.
- 6. Only teachers of grades 4 and 5 are required to pass an adequate content test.

Figure 18

Do states measure knowledge of math of early childhood teachers who can teach elementary grades?



1. Strong Practice: Florida, Indiana, New York, Virginia

- 2. Alabama, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Idaho, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin
- 3. Arizona, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 4. Alaska, Arkansas, California, Georgia, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas These states do not offer a standalone early childhood certification that includes elementary grades or the state's early childhood certification is the de facto license to teach elementary grades.

Goal E – Middle School Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that middle school teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require that new middle school teachers pass a licensing test in every core academic area that they are licensed to teach.
- 2. The state should not permit middle school teachers to teach on a generalist license that does not differentiate between the preparation of middle school teachers and that of elementary teachers.
- 3. The state should encourage middle school candidates who are licensed to teach multiple subjects to earn minors in two core academic areas rather than earn a single major. Middle school candidates licensed to teach a single subject area should earn a major in that area.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 19

How States are Faring in Middle School Teacher Preparation



Best Practice States Georgia, Mississippi, New Jersey, South Carolina

19 States Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Indiana, Iowa¹, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, Ohio¹, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island¹, Texas¹, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia



3

States Nearly Meet Goal Maryland, New York, North Carolina 1, Tennessee

States Partly Meet Goal Massachusetts, Minnesota, Wisconsin

7 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Michigan, Nevada, NEW MEXICO, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming

14 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii↓, Idaho, Illinois, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

1:5 ↔:45 ↓:1

1-E Analysis: **New Mexico**

State Meets a Small Part of Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico offers a middle school license for middle school teachers; candidates must earn 24 semester hours in at least one content-related area. Teachers with secondary certificates are allowed to teach single subjects in middle school. Those candidates must complete 24-36 semester hours in at least one content-related area. Regrettably, the state allows middle school teachers to teach on a generalist K-8 license.

All new middle school teachers in New Mexico are also required to pass a subject-matter test to attain licensure. However, only secondary and middle school candidates are required to pass a single-subject content test. Those seeking the elementary license are only required to pass the general content test for elementary education; therefore, there is no assurance that these middle school teachers will have sufficient knowledge in each subject they teach.

Supporting Research Test Requirement www.nmta.nesinc.com New Mexico Administrative Code 6.61.2, -.3, -.4

RECOMMENDATION

Require content testing in all core areas.

New Mexico should require subject-matter testing for all middle school teacher candidates in every core academic area they intend to teach as a condition of initial licensure. To ensure meaningful middle school content tests, the state should set its passing scores to reflect high levels of performance.

Eliminate the generalist license.

New Mexico should not allow middle school teachers to teach on a generalist license that does not differentiate between the preparation of middle school teachers and that of elementary teachers. These teachers are less likely to be adequately prepared to teach core academic areas at the middle school level because their preparation requirements are not specific to the middle or secondary levels and they need not pass a subject-matter test in each subject they teach. Adopting middle school teacher preparation policies for all such teachers will help ensure that students in grades 7 and 8 have teachers who are appropriately prepared to teach grade-level content, which is different and more advanced than what elementary teachers teach.

Strengthen middle school teachers' subject-matter preparation.

New Mexico should encourage middle school teachers who plan to teach multiple subjects to earn two minors in two core academic areas, rather than a single major. However, the state should retain its requirement for a subject-area major for middle school candidates who intend to teach a single subject.

Close the loophole that allows teachers to add middle grade levels to an existing license without demonstrating content knowledge.

New Mexico allows teachers to add certain middle-level endorsements to an existing certificate with just coursework. The state is urged to require that all teachers who add the middle grade levels to their certificates pass a rigorous subject-matter test to ensure content knowledge of all subject areas before they are allowed in the classroom.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 20	FFERED	tor boms	/
Do states distinguish middle grade preparation from elementary preparation?	K-8 UCENSE NOT OFFERED	As license offered for self-contained dassrooms	k-8 license offered
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			1
Arkansas			
California		2	
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi	<u> </u>		
Missouri			
Montana Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
NEW MEXICO			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota			1
Ohio			
Oklahoma			3
Oregon			4
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			1
Wisconsin			.
Wyoming			
	31	5	15

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Georgia, Mississippi, New Jersey and South Carolina ensure that all middle school teacher candidates are adequately prepared to teach middle school-level content. None of these states offers a K-8 generalist license and all require passing scores on subject-specific content tests. Georgia, Mississippi and South Carolina explicitly require at least two content-area minors, and New Jersey requires a content major along with a minor for each additional area of certification.

1. Offers 1-8 license.

2. California offers a K-12 generalist license for all self-contained classrooms.

3. With the exception of mathematics.

4. Oregon offers 3-8 license.

		,	,	,
Figure 21		No. test does not epoch	5	
Do middle school teachers		5	No, K-8 license equipeds	No, testing of all subjects
have to pass an appropriate		, Tepc	re su Pulir	st subje
content test in every core		s not	i je	of all
		s for	s lice Thent	ting
subject they are licensed	6	o, tes	Vele,	o, tes
to teach?	YES	Pres V	× 16	100
Alabama				
Alaska				1
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				2
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia Hawaii				
			3	
Idaho Illinois				
Indiana				
lowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
Maryland	4			
Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi				
Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey				
NEW MEXICO				
New York	5			
North Carolina	6			
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma				
Oregon			7	
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia				
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
	26	3	16	6

1. Alaska does not require content tests for initial licensure.

- 2. Candidates teaching multiple subjects only have to pass the elementary test. Single-subject credential does not require test.
- 3. For K-8 license, Idaho also requires a single-subject test.
- 4. Maryland allows elementary teachers to teach in departmentalized middle schools if not less than 50 percent of the teaching assignment is within the elementary education grades.
- 5. For nondepartmentalized classrooms, generalist in middle childhood education candidates must pass new assessment with three subtests.
- 6. Teachers may have until second year to pass tests, if they attempt to pass them during their first year.
- 7. Candidates opting for middle-level endorsement may either complete a major or pass a content test.

Goal F – Secondary Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that secondary teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require that secondary teachers pass a licensing test in every subject they are licensed to teach.
- 2. The state should require secondary social studies teachers to pass a subject-matter test of each social studies discipline they are licensed to teach.
- 3. The state should require that secondary teachers pass a content test when adding subject-area endorsements to an existing license.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 22

How States are Faring in Secondary Teacher Preparation



3 Best Practice States Georgia, Indiana, Tennessee



States Meet Goal Minnesota, South Dakota

28 States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri ¹, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon ¹, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island ¹, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin

8 States Partly Meet Goal District of Columbia, Iowa 1, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Nebraska 1, Nevada, NEW MEXICO



State Meets a Small Part of Goal North Carolina

9 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii 1, Montana, New Hampshire, Washington, Wyoming

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

1-F Analysis: **New Mexico**

State Partly Meets Goal 🛛 (🔶 Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico requires that its secondary teacher candidates pass a content test to teach any core secondary subjects.

Unfortunately, New Mexico permits a significant loophole to this important policy by allowing both general science and general social studies licenses, without requiring subject-matter testing for each subject area within these disciplines.

New Mexico's general social studies certification area is called "history, geography, economics, civics and government." Candidates must pass the NMTA History, Geography, Economics, Civics and Government assessment, which only provides a composite passing score. Teachers with this license are not limited to teaching general social studies but rather can teach any of the specified areas. (For the state's science loophole, see Goal 1-G.)

To add a secondary endorsement to an existing license, teachers in New Mexico must either pass a content test or earn 24-36 semester hours of credit in the subject area.

Supporting Research New Mexico Teacher Assessments www.nmta.nesinc.com New Mexico Administrative Code 6.61.4.8 Adding an Endorsement http://ped.state.nm.us/licensure/2010/endorsements/index.html

RECOMMENDATION

Require subject-matter testing for all secondary teacher candidates.

New Mexico wisely requires subject-matter tests for most secondary teachers but should address any loopholes that undermine this policy (see Goal 1-G).

Require secondary social studies teachers to pass a content test for each discipline they are licensed to teach.

By allowing a general social studies certification—and only requiring a general knowledge social studies exam—New Mexico is not ensuring that its secondary teachers possess adequate subject-specific content knowledge. The state's required assessment combines all subject areas (e.g., history, geography, economics) and does not report separate scores for each subject area.

Require subject-matter testing when adding subject-area endorsements.

New Mexico should require passing scores on subject-specific content tests, regardless of other coursework or degree requirements, for teachers who are licensed in core secondary subjects and wish to add another subject area, or endorsement, to their licenses. While coursework may be generally indicative of background in a particular subject area, only a subject-matter test ensures that teachers know the specific content they will need to teach.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Georgia, Indiana and Tennessee require that all secondary teacher candidates pass a content test to teach any core secondary subject—both as a condition of licensure and to add an additional field to a secondary license. Further, none of these states offers secondary certification in general social studies; all teachers must be certified in a specific discipline. Also worthy of mention is **Missouri**, which now requires its general social studies teachers to pass a multi-content test with six independently scored subtests.

Figure 23

Does a secondary teacher have to pass a content test in every subject area for licensure?



1. Strong Practice: Indiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Tennessee

- 2. Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina⁴, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin [For more on loopholes, see Goal 1-G (science) and Figure 25 (social studies).]
- Alaska, Arizona⁵, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Montana, New Hampshire⁵, Washington, Wyoming⁶
- 4. Teachers may also have until second year to pass tests, if they attempt to pass them during their first year.
- 5. Candidates with a master's degree in the subject area do not have to pass a content test.
- 6. Only secondary comprehensive social studies teachers must pass a content test.

Figure 24

Does a secondary teacher have to pass a content test in every subject area to add an endorsement?



1. Strong Practice: Indiana, Minnesota, Tennessee

- Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin (Science is discussed in Goal 1-G.)
- Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Washington, Wyoming

Figure 25



1. Strong Practice: Georgia, Indiana, South Dakota, Tennessee

- 2. Strong Practice: Minnesota⁴, Missouri
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma⁵, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 4. Minnesota's test for general social studies is divided into two individually scored subtests.
- 5. Oklahoma offers combination licenses.

Goal G – Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science

The state should ensure that secondary science teachers know all the subject matter they are licensed to teach.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should require secondary science teachers to pass a subject-matter test in each science discipline they are licensed to teach.
- 2. If a general science or combination science certification is offered, the state should require teachers to pass a subject-matter test in each science discipline they are licensed to teach under those certifications.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 26

How States are Faring in Preparation to Teach Science



Best Practice State

13 States Meet Goal Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island 1, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia 1

2

States Nearly Meet Goal Arizona 1, Arkansas

States Partly Meet Goal Georgia, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah

0 States Meet a Small Part of Goal

28 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, NEW MEXICO, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

1:4 ↔:47 **↓**:0

1-G Analysis: New Mexico

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico only offers secondary certification in general science. Candidates must pass the NMTA Science assessment. Teachers with this license are not limited to teaching general science but rather can teach any of the topical areas.

Supporting Research New Mexico Teacher Assessments www.nmta.nesinc.com

RECOMMENDATION

Require secondary science teachers to pass a content test for each discipline they are licensed to teach.

By allowing a general science certification—and only requiring a general knowledge science exam— New Mexico is not ensuring that these secondary teachers possess adequate subject-specific content knowledge. The state's required assessment combines all subject areas (e.g., biology, chemistry, physics) and does not report separate scores for each area. Therefore, candidates could answer many—perhaps all—chemistry questions, for example, incorrectly yet still be licensed to teach chemistry to high school students.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 27	L.	OFERS GENERAL STENC	. /	Offers Beneral science or without aden, itenses or	
Do states ensure that	SUBI			, to	జ
secondary general science	NOLE		TEST te-sul	cienc Ises	testi
teachers have adequate	MY S		V sing Nses v	Peral s n lice	dle
subject-matter knowledge?	ESCO ELLCO MELCO	PER CI	rs onl ce lice, ite tes	rs ger inatic it ade	
subject matter knowledge.	E S S	E S E	Scien. Gequi	Offe Comb Vithou	
Alabama	OFFES ONLY SNOLE-SUBJECT	/	Offersonly single subject	z	
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia				2 2	
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana Iowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
NEW MEXICO					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island		1			
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia		1			
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	10	5	1	35	

T EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE

Missouri ensures that its secondary science teachers know the content they teach by taking a dual approach to general secondary science certification. The state offers general science certification but only allows these candidates to teach general science courses. Missouri also offers an umbrella certification-called unified sciencethat requires candidates to pass individual subtests in biology, chemistry, earth science and physics. These certifications are offered in addition to single-subject licenses.

1. Teachers with the general science license may only teach general science courses.

2. Georgia's science test consists of two subtests.
Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal H – Special Education Teacher Preparation

The state should ensure that special education teachers know the subject matter they are licensed to teach.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should not permit special education teachers to teach on a K-12 license that does not differentiate between the preparation of elementary teachers and that of secondary teachers.
- All elementary special education candidates should be required to pass a subjectmatter test for licensure that is no less rigorous than what is required of general education candidates.
- 3. The state should ensure that secondary special education teachers possess adequate content knowledge.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 28 How States are Faring in Preparation to Teach Social Studies 0 **Best Practice States** States Meet Goal n States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama¹, New York¹, Rhode Island¹, Texas 1 8 States Partly Meet Goal Idaho¹, Iowa¹, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Wisconsin 10 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Colorado, Connecticut¹, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, North Carolina¹, Oregon, Tennessee 1, Vermont, Virginia 1 29 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas I, California, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas I, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, NEW MEXICO, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:9 👄 : 39 4:3

1-H Analysis: New Mexico

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico only offers a K-12 special education certification.

The state does not require content testing for any of its special education teacher candidates.

Supporting Research New Mexico Administrative Code 6.61.6.8 PK-12 Certification Requirements http://www.ped.state.nm.us/licensure/2010/dl10/chklstSpecialEducationPreK-12.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

End licensure practices that fail to distinguish between the skills and knowledge needed to teach elementary grades and secondary grades.

It is virtually impossible and certainly impractical for New Mexico to ensure that a K-12 special education teacher knows all the subject matter he or she is expected to be able to teach, especially considering state and federal expectations that special education students should meet the same high standards as other students. While the broad K-12 umbrella may be appropriate for teachers of low-incidence special education students, such as those with severe cognitive disabilities, it is deeply problematic for the overwhelming majority of high-incidence special education students, who are expected to learn grade-level content.

Require that elementary special education candidates pass a rigorous content test as a condition of initial licensure.

To ensure that special education teacher candidates who will teach elementary grades possess sufficient knowledge of the subject matter at hand, New Mexico should require a rigorous content test that reports separate passing scores for each content area. New Mexico should also set these passing scores to reflect high levels of performance. Failure to ensure that teachers possess requisite content knowledge deprives special education students of the opportunity to reach their academic potential.

Ensure that secondary special education teachers possess adequate content knowledge.

Secondary special education teachers are frequently generalists who teach many core subject areas. While it may be unreasonable to expect secondary special education teachers to meet the same requirements for each subject they teach as other teachers who teach only one subject, New Mexico's current policy of requiring no subject-matter testing is problematic and will not help special education students to meet rigorous learning standards. To provide a middle ground, New Mexico should consider a customized HOUSSE route for new secondary special education teachers and look to the flexibility offered by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), which allows for a combination of testing and coursework to demonstrate requisite content knowledge in the classroom.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 20		/	_ /
Figure 29	DOESNOT OFERA	Offers K. 22 and Back-specific cents.	ation(s)
Do states distinguish	FER.	nd Certis	K-15
between elementary	101 OHU	cific	ion a
and secondary special education teachers?	DESA 12 GE	Hers,	Differs Trificat
	~~	/ ~ & /	Offers only a K-12
Alabama Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana Maine			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey	1		
NEW MEXICO			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	16	7	28

EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Unfortunately, NCTQ cannot award "best practice" honors to any state's policy in the area of special education. However, two states-New York and Rhode Island-are worthy of mention for taking steps in the right direction in ensuring that all special education teachers know the subject matter they are required to teach. Both states require that elementary special education candidates pass the same elementary content tests, which are comprised of individual subtests, as general education elementary teachers. Secondary special education teachers in New York must pass a newly developed multisubject content test for special education teachers comprised of three separately scored sections. Rhode Island requires its secondary special education teachers to hold certification in another secondary area.

Figure 30

Which states require subject-matter testing for special education teachers?

Elementary Subject-Matter Test				
Required for an elementary special education license	Alabama, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania ¹ , Rhode Island, Texas, West Virginia ² , Wisconsin			
Required for a K-12 special education license	Colorado, Idaho, North Carolina			
Secondary	y Subject-Matter Test(s)			
Tests in all core subjects required for secondary special education license	New York ³			
Test in at least one subject required for secondary special education license	Louisiana, New Jersey, Pennsylvania ¹ , Rhode Island, West Virginia ²			
Required for a K-12 special education license	None			

1. In Pennsylvania, a candidate who opts for dual certification in elementary or secondary special education and as a reading specialist does not have to take a content test.

2. West Virginia also allows elementary special education candidates to earn dual certification in early childhood, which would not require a content test. Secondary special education candidates earning a dual certification as a reading specialist are similarly exempted.

3. New York requires a multi-subject content test specifically geared to secondary special education candidates. It is divided into three subtests.

Figure 29:

1. Although New Jersey does issue a K-12 certificate, candidates must meet discrete elementary and/or secondary requirements.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal I – Assessing Professional Knowledge

The state should use a licensing test to verify that all new teachers meet its professional standards.

Goal Component

(The factor considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

1. The state should assess new teachers' knowledge of teaching and learning by means of a pedagogy test aligned to the state's professional standards.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 31

How States are Faring in Special Education **Teacher Preparation** Best Practice States 28 States Meet Goal Alabama¹, Arizona, Arkansas, California, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Indiana 1, Iowa¹, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, NEW MEXICO, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island¹, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington 1, West Virginia States Nearly Meet Goal Maryland, North Carolina 1 3 States Partly Meet Goal Connecticut, Pennsylvania¹, Utah States Meet a Small Part of Goal 3 Massachusetts, Missouri, Wyoming 15 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oregon, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin Progress on this Goal Since 2011: **1**:7 (↔):43 ↓:1

1-I Analysis: New Mexico State Meets Goal Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico requires all new teachers to pass a pedagogy test from its own New Mexico Teacher Assessments (NMTA) series.

Supporting Research

http://www.ped.state.nm.us/Licensure/testingRequirements.html

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although NCTQ has not singled out one state's policies for "best practice" honors, it commends the many states that require a pedagogy assessment to verify that all new teachers meet professional standards.

Figure 32

Do states measure new teachers' knowledge of teaching and learning?



1. Strong Practice: California, Illinois⁵, New York, Tennessee⁶, Washington

2. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, District of Columbia, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina⁷, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, West Virginia

3. Connecticut, Maryland, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Utah⁸, Wyoming

4. Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oregon, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin

5. Beginning in 2015.

6. Teachers may pass either the edTPA or a Praxis pedagogy test.

7. Teachers have until their second year to pass if they attempt to pass during their first year.

8. Not required until teacher advances from a Level One to a Level Two license.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal J – Student Teaching

The state should ensure that teacher preparation programs provide teacher candidates with a high quality clinical experience.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should require that student teachers only be placed with cooperating teachers for whom there is evidence of their effectiveness as measured by consistent gains in student learning.
- 2. The state should require that teacher candidates spend at least 10 weeks student teaching.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 33 How States are Faring in Student Teaching 3 **Best Practice States** Florida, Rhode Island 1, Tennessee State Meets Goal Massachusetts 1 States Nearly Meet Goal Connecticut¹, Kentucky 24 States Partly Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware 1, Georgia 1, Hawaii, Illinois 1, Iowa, Kansas, Maine 1, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri 1, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin States Meet a Small Part of Goal Indiana, Michigan, Oregon, South Dakota 17 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Idaho, Louisiana, Maryland, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire I, NEW MEXICO, New York, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: •:42 ↓:1 1:8

1-J Analysis: **New Mexico**State Does Not Meet Goal \bigcirc Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico requires candidates to complete no less than 14 weeks of student teaching, with one portion taking place in the first 30 credit hours in the college of education and another portion occurring during the senior year.

The state does not address the qualifications of cooperating teachers.

Supporting Research N.M.S.A. 22-10A-6

RECOMMENDATION

Ensure that cooperating teachers have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness as measured by student learning.

In addition to the ability to mentor an adult, cooperating teachers in New Mexico should also be carefully screened for their capacity to further student achievement. Research indicates that the only aspect of a student teaching arrangement that has been shown to have an impact on student achievement is the positive effect of selection of the cooperating teacher by the preparation program, rather than by the student teacher or school district staff.

Use evidence from the state's teacher evaluation system to select cooperating teachers.

New Mexico requires objective measures of student growth to be the preponderant criterion of its teacher evaluations. The state should therefore utilize its evaluation results, which provide evidence of effectiveness in the classroom, in the selection of effective cooperating teachers.

Require teacher candidates to spend at least 10 weeks student teaching.

New Mexico should require student teaching to be a full-time commitment, as requiring coursework and student teaching simultaneously does a disservice to both. Alignment with a school calendar for at least 10 weeks ensures both adequate classroom experience and exposure to a variety of ancillary professional activities. The state's current policy regarding student teaching does not ensure at least a 10-week summative experience. Although it is wise and important to make sure candidates get practical exposure early on and throughout their preparation, the language in the New Mexico statute allows programs to shortchange the portion that matters most.

Explicitly require that student teaching be completed locally, thus prohibiting candidates from completing this requirement abroad.

Unless preparation programs can establish true satellite campuses to closely supervise student teaching arrangements, placement in foreign or otherwise novel locales should be supplementary to a standard student teaching arrangement. Outsourcing the arrangements for student teaching makes it impossible to ensure the selection of the best cooperating teacher and adequate supervision of the student teacher and may prevent training of the teacher on relevant state instructional frameworks.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis. The state also noted that it is working with IHEs to establish criteria for placing student teachers, and that the NMTEACH effectiveness rating will be one required determining factor.

Figure 34	COPERATING TACHER	STURNT FEAMS
<i>Do states ensure a high-quality student</i>	ERATINC D BASED ENESS	NT TEAC
teaching experience?	COOP SELECT EFFECT	STUDI LASTS
Alabama		
Alaska		
Arizona		
Arkansas		
California		
Colorado		
Connecticut		
Delaware		
District of Columbia		
Florida		
Georgia Hawaii		
Idaho		
Illinois		
Indiana		
lowa		
Kansas		
Kentucky		
Louisiana		
Maine		
Maryland		
Massachusetts		
Michigan		
Minnesota		
Mississippi		
Missouri		
Montana		
Nebraska		
Nevada		
New Hampshire		
New Jersey		
NEW MEXICO		
New York		
North Carolina North Dakota		
Ohio		
Oklahoma		
Oregon		
Pennsylvania		
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
South Dakota		
Tennessee		
Texas		
Utah		
Vermont		
Virginia		
Washington		
West Virginia		1
Wisconsin		
Wyoming		
	5	32

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Florida, Rhode Island and Tennessee not only require teacher candidates to complete at least 10 weeks of full-time student teaching, but they also all require that cooperating teachers have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness as measured by student learning.

1. West Virginia allows candidates to student teach for less than 12 weeks if determined to be proficient.

Is the selection of the cooperating teacher based on some measure of effectiveness?



1. Strong Practice: Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Tennessee

- 2. Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin
- Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming

Figure 36

Is the student teaching experience of sufficient length?



 Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia⁵, Wisconsin

- 2. Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Virginia, Wyoming
- 3. Illinois, New Hampshire, Utah
- 4. Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Maryland, Montana
- 5. West Virginia allows candidates to student teach for less than 12 weeks if determined to be proficient.

Area 1: Delivering Well-Prepared Teachers

Goal K – Teacher Preparation Program Accountability

The state's approval process for teacher preparation programs should hold programs accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should collect data that connects student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs. Such data can include value added or growth analyses conducted specifically for this purpose or evaluation ratings that incorporate objective measures of student learning to a significant extent.
- 2. The state should collect other meaningful data that reflect program performance, including some or all of the following:

a. Average raw scores of teacher candidates on licensing tests, including academic proficiency, subject-matter and professional-knowledge tests;

b. Number of times, on average, it takes teacher candidates to pass licensing tests;

c. Satisfaction ratings by school principals and teacher supervisors of programs' student teachers, using a standardized form to permit program comparison and

d. Five-year retention rates of graduates in the teaching profession.

- 3. The state should establish the minimum standard of performance for each category of data. Programs should be held accountable for meeting these standards, with articulated consequences for failing to do so, including loss of program approval.
- 4. The state should produce and publish on its website an annual report card that shows all the data the state collects on individual teacher preparation programs.
- 5. The state should retain full authority over its process for approving teacher preparation programs.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 37

How States are Faring in Teacher Preparation Program Accountability



Best Practice States



State Meets Goal Louisiana





States Partly Meet Goal Indiana⁺, Kentucky, Massachusetts⁺, Michigan, Nevada, South Carolina, Washington⁺, Wisconsin⁺

- 18 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona, California 1, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas 1, Maine 1, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire 1, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Oregon 1, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia
 - 14 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Minnesota, Nebraska, NEW MEXICO, New York, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

🕇:13 🔶:38 🖡:0

1-K Analysis: **New Mexico**

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico's approval process for its traditional and alternate route teacher preparation programs does not hold programs accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce.

Most importantly, New Mexico does not collect or report data that connect student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs.

The state also fails to collect other objective, meaningful data to measure the performance of teacher preparation programs, and it does not apply any transparent, measurable criteria for conferring program approval. New Mexico collects programs' annual summary licensure test pass rates (80 percent of program completers must pass their licensure exams). However, the 80 percent pass-rate standard, while common among many states, sets the bar quite low and is not a meaningful measure of program performance.

Further, in the past three years, no programs in the state have been identified as low performing—an additional indicator that programs lack accountability.

The state's website does not include a report card that allows the public to review and compare program performance.

In New Mexico, there is some overlap of accreditation and state approval. Members of NCATE/CAEP and the state make up the review team and decisions are made jointly; state members must complete NCATE/CAEP training. New Mexico conducts its own program reviews.

Supporting Research New Mexico Administrative Code 6.65.2 Title II State Reports https://title2.ed.gov www.ncate.org

RECOMMENDATION

Collect data that connect student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs.

As one way to measure whether programs are producing effective classroom teachers, New Mexico should consider the academic achievement gains of students taught by programs' graduates, averaged over the first three years of teaching. Data that are aggregated to the institution (e.g., combining elementary and secondary programs) rather than disaggregated to the specific preparation program are not useful for accountability purposes. Such aggregation can mask significant differences in performance among programs.

Gather other meaningful data that reflect program performance.

Although measures of student growth are an important indicator of program effectiveness, they cannot be the sole measure of program quality for several reasons, including the fact that many programs may have graduates whose students do not take standardized tests. The accountability system must therefore include other objective measures that show how well programs are preparing teachers for the classroom, such as:

- 1. Evaluation results from the first and/or second year of teaching;
- 2. Satisfaction ratings by school principals and teacher supervisors of programs' student teachers, using a standardized form to permit program comparison;

- 3. Average raw scores of teacher candidates on licensing tests, including academic proficiency, subject matter and professional knowledge tests;
- 4. Number of times, on average, it takes teacher candidates to pass licensing tests; and
- 5. Five-year retention rates of graduates in the teaching profession.

Establish the minimum standard of performance for each category of data.

Merely collecting the types of data described above is insufficient for accountability purposes. The next and perhaps more critical step is for the state to establish precise minimum standards for teacher preparation program performance for each category of data. New Mexico should be mindful of setting rigorous standards for program performance, as its current requirement that 80 percent of program graduates pass the state's licensing tests is too low a bar. Programs should be held accountable for meeting rigorous standards, and there should be consequences for failing to do so, including loss of program approval.

Publish an annual report card on the state's website.

New Mexico should produce an annual report card that shows all the data the state collects on individual teacher preparation programs, which should be published on the state's website at the program level for the sake of public transparency. Data should be presented in a manner that clearly conveys whether programs have met performance standards.

Maintain full authority over the process for approving teacher preparation programs.

New Mexico should ensure that it is the state that considers the evidence of program performance and makes the decision about whether programs should continue to be authorized to prepare teachers.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 38	OBIECTIVE PROGRAM. SPECIFIC DATA COLLED.	CIED .	BSJTE
Do states hold teacher preparation programs	TIVE PROCE CDATA COL	PERFORMANCE CR	DATA PUBLICLY AVAILABLICLY AVAILABLE ON WEBSITE
accountable?	OBJE SPECIF	PERFO	DATZ
Alabama		1	
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			2
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			2
Louisiana			2
Maine	1		
Maryland	3		
Massachusetts			
Michigan		1	
Minnesota			
Mississippi	1		
Missouri			
Montana Nebraska	1		
Nevada ¹			
New Hampshire			
	1		
New Jersey NEW MEXICO			
New York			
North Carolina			2
North Dakota			
Ohio ¹			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania	1		
Rhode Island			
South Carolina ¹			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia	1		
Washington			
West Virginia	1		
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	36	4	19

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

NCTQ is not awarding "best practice" honors to any state's policy in the area of teacher preparation program accountability. However, the following states should be commended for collecting data that connect student achievement gains to teacher preparation programs: Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, Tennessee and Texas.

Figure 39

Do states connect student achievement data to teacher preparation programs?



1. Strong Practice: Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas

2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia³, Hawaii³, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland³, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York³, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

3. Included in state's Race to the Top plan, but not in policy or yet implemented.

1. For traditional preparation programs only.

2. State does not distinguish between alternate route programs and traditional

preparation programs in public reporting.

3. For alternate routes only.

Which states collect meaningful data?

STUDENT LEARNING GAINS

Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas

EVALUATION RESULTS FOR PROGRAM GRADUATES Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas

AVERAGE RAW SCORES ON LICENSING TESTS

Alabama, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, West Virginia

SATISFACTION RATINGS FROM SCHOOLS

Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland¹, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia

TEACHER RETENTION RATES

Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Maine, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Tennessee, Texas

1. For alternate route only

1. National accreditation can be substituted for state approval. 2. For institutions with 2,000 or more full-time equivalent students

National accreditation is required for program approval Figure 41 Overlap of accreditation and state approval STATEHAS ITS OWN What is the relationship between state program approval and national accreditation? Alabama Alaska \square Arizona Arkansas California \square Colorado Connecticut \square \square Delaware \square District of Columbia \square Florida \square Georgia Hawaii \square Idaho \square \square Illinois Indiana \square lowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana \square \square Maine \square Maryland \square Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota \square \square Mississippi Missouri \square Montana \square Nebraska Nevada \square \square New Hampshire \square \square New Jersey \square \square **NEW MEXICO** \square \square New York \square North Carolina Ø North Dakota \Box Ohio \square Oklahoma \square Oregon Pennsylvania \square Rhode Island South Carolina \square \square South Dakota Tennessee Texas \square Utah \square Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia \square Wisconsin Wyoming

7

31

13



Area 2 Summary

How States are Faring in Expanding the Pool of Teachers

State Area Grades



Topics Included In This Area

- 2-A: Alternate Route Eligibility
- 2-B: Alternate Route Preparation
- 2-C: Alternate Route Usage and Providers
- 2-D: Part-Time Teaching Licenses
- 2-E: Licensure Reciprocity

Area 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool

Goal A – Alternate Route Eligibility

The state should require alternate route programs to exceed the admission requirements of traditional preparation programs while also being flexible to the needs of nontraditional candidates.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- With some accommodation for work experience, alternate route programs should set a rigorous bar for program entry by requiring that candidates take a rigorous test to demonstrate academic ability, such as the GRE.
- 2. All alternate route candidates, including elementary candidates and those having a major in their intended subject area, should be required to pass the state's subject-matter licensing test.
- 3. Alternate route candidates lacking a major in the intended subject area should be able to demonstrate subject-matter knowledge by passing a test of sufficient rigor.

The components for this goal have changed since 2011. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 42

How States are Faring in Alternate Route Eligibility

Best Practice States 2 District of Columbia, Michigan State Meets Goal Minnesota 13 States Nearly Meet Goal Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey 1, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Washington 11 States Partly Meet Goal Alabama, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, New York, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas 1, Virginia 15 States Meet a Small Part of Goal California, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia 9 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Hawaii, Montana, Nebraska, NEW MEXICO, North Dakota, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:2 👄 : 49 📕 : 0

2-A Analysis: New Mexico

State Does Not Meet Goal 🕋 Bar Raised for this Goal 🕒 Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Although New Mexico outlines several alternate routes to licensure, there do not appear to be any state guidelines for program admission.

Supporting Research

NMAC 6.60.3 Alternative Licensure Program Requirements http://www.ped.state.nm.us/Licensure/2010/index.html

RECOMMENDATION

Establish guidelines for alternate route programs.

New Mexico should develop guidelines that ensure that alternate route candidates are screened for academic ability and have the required subject-matter knowledge prior to admission to an alternate route program. The state should also ensure that programs are sufficiently flexible regarding the needs of nontraditional candidates.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.



T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

The **District of Columbia** and **Michigan** require candidates to demonstrate aboveaverage academic performance as a condition of admission to an alternate route program, with both requiring applicants to have a minimum 3.0 GPA. In addition, neither requires a content-specific major; subjectarea knowledge is demonstrated by passing a test, making their alternate routes flexible to the needs of nontraditional candidates.

Figure 44

Do states require alternate routes to be selective?



- 1. Strong Practice: Connecticut, District of Columbia, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, Rhode Island
- 2. Alabama, Illinois⁵, Indiana, Kentucky⁶, New York, Pennsylvania
- 3. Alaska, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 4. Arizona, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, Utah
- 5. Illinois' routes are in the process of converting to a single new license.
- 6. Only one of Kentucky's eight alternate routes has a 3.0 GPA requirement.

Do states accommodate the nontraditional background of alternate route candidates?



1. Strong Practice: Alabama, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Maine, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas

- 2. Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, District of Columbia, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Ohio, Washington
- 3. Connecticut, Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Virginia
- 4. Alaska, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 5. Hawaii, Idaho, New Mexico, North Dakota

Area 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool

Goal B – Alternate Route Preparation

The state should ensure that its alternate routes provide efficient preparation that is relevant to the immediate needs of new teachers, as well as adequate mentoring and support.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should ensure that the amount of coursework it either requires or allows is manageable for a novice teacher. Anything exceeding 12 credit hours of coursework in the first year may be counterproductive, placing too great a burden on the teacher. This calculation is premised on no more than 6 credit hours in the summer, three in the fall and three in the spring.
- 2. The state should ensure that alternate route programs offer accelerated study not to exceed six (three credit) courses for secondary teachers and eight (three credit) courses for elementary teachers (exclusive of any credit for practice teaching or mentoring) over the duration of the program. Programs should be limited to two years, at which time the new teacher should be eligible for a standard certificate.
- 3. All coursework requirements should target the immediate needs of the new teacher (e.g., seminars with other grade-level teachers, training in a particular curriculum, reading instruction, classroom management techniques).
- 4. The state should require intensive induction support, beginning with a trained mentor assigned full time to the new teacher for the first critical weeks of school and then gradually reduced over the course of the entire first year. The state should support only induction strategies that can be effective even in a poorly managed school: intensive mentoring, seminars appropriate to grade level or subject area, a reduced teaching load and frequent release time to observe effective teachers. Ideally, candidates would also have an opportunity to practice teach in a summer training program.

The components for this goal have changed since 2011. In light of state progress on this topic, the bar for this goal has been raised.

Figure 46

How States are Faring in Alternate Route Preparation 2 Best Practice States Delaware, New Jersey



- 4 States Nearly Meet Goal Connecticut, Maryland, Mississippi, South Carolina
- **15** States Partly Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, California, Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia
- 20 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona, Colorado, District of Columbia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, NEW MEXICO, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wyoming

8 States Do Not Meet Goal Hawaii, Montana, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Vermont, Wisconsin

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

1:0 ↔:51 ↓:0

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

2-B Analysis: **New Mexico**

State Meets a Small Part of Goal

Raised for this Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico provides alternative certification through two pathways, approved preparation program or portfolio review.

For candidates completing a preparation program, coursework must consist of 12-21 credit hours. The state requires all candidates, whether in an approved program or through portfolio review, to take coursework in the teaching of reading.

Providers of an alternate route program are required to include a student teaching or field placement component. For both routes, New Mexico offers a mentoring program for at least one year and not more than three years. The program is designed by the local district and approved by the State Board of Education.

After one year of teaching, candidates receive an internship that is good for three years. After three years and successful program completion, candidates may apply for a standard license.

Supporting Research

New Mexico Administrative Code 6.60.3.8

RECOMMENDATION

Establish coursework guidelines for all alternate route preparation programs.

New Mexico is commended for requiring all applicants, even those in the portfolio review process, to take courses in the teaching of reading. However, for the remainder of the coursework, simply mandating coursework without specifying the purpose can inadvertently send the wrong message to program providers—that "anything goes" as long as credits are granted. However constructive, any course that is not fundamentally practical and immediately necessary should be eliminated as a requirement.

Ensure that new teachers are supported in the first year of teaching.

New Mexico should provide more detailed guidelines for its induction program to ensure that new teachers will receive the support they need to facilitate their success in the classroom. Effective strategies include practice teaching prior to teaching in the classroom, intensive mentoring with full classroom support in the first few weeks or months of school, a reduced teaching load and release time to allow new teachers to observe experienced teachers during each school day.

Ensure program completion in fewer than two years.

New Mexico should consider shortening the length of time it takes an alternate route teacher to earn standard certification. The route should allow candidates to earn full certification no later than the end of the second year of teaching.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

gure 47		/	WORK	4	/ 5
o states' alternate routes rovide efficient preparation	EFFICIENT COURSEWORK	RELEVANT COURS	REASONABLE PROGRAMILE	PRACTICE TEACHING	INTENSIVE SUPPORT
hat meets the immediate eeds of new teachers?	EFFICIEI COURSE	RELEVAN	REASON PROGRA	PRACTI OPPORT	INTENS
Alabama					
Alaska		*	*	*	
Arizona			*	*	
Arkansas	*	*	*		*
California			*		
Colorado	*		*		
Connecticut	*	*	*	*	
Delaware	*	*	*	*	*
District of Columbia				*	
Florida			*		
Georgia	*	*	*		*
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana				*	
lowa			*	*	
Kansas			*		
Kentucky					*
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland		*	*	*	*
Massachusetts		*		*	
Michigan				*	
Minnesota			*		
Mississippi	*	*	*		
Missouri					*
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey NEW MEXICO				 ▲	
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio				-	
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island	*	*		*	
South Carolina	$\hat{\mathbf{x}}$	$\widehat{\mathbf{+}}$			*
South Dakota			+		
Tennessee			$\widehat{\Box}$		
Texas			*		
Utah					
Vermont				*	
Virginia	*				
Washington			*		*
West Virginia		*	*		*
Wisconsin					
Wyoming			+		

TEXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Delaware and New Jersey ensure that alternate routes provide efficient preparation that meets the needs of new teachers. Both states require a manageable number of credit hours, relevant coursework, a field placement and intensive mentoring.

Area 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool

Goal C – Alternate Route Usage and Providers

The state should provide an alternate route that is free from limitations on its usage and allows a diversity of providers.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should not treat the alternate route as a program of last resort or restrict the availability of alternate routes to certain subjects, grades or geographic areas.
- 2. The state should allow districts and nonprofit organizations other than institutions of higher education to operate alternate route programs.
- 3. The state should ensure that its alternate route has no requirements that would be difficult to meet for a provider that is not an institution of higher education (e.g., an approval process based on institutional accreditation).

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 48

How States are Faring in Alternate Route Usage and Providers



Best Practice States

23 States Meet Goal Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island,



States Nearly Meet Goal Minnesota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania↓, South Carolina↑, Utah

Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington

12 States Partly Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas↓, Delaware, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, NEW MEXICO, Oklahoma, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin

States Meet a Small Part of Goal Hawaii, Idaho, Missouri, South Dakota

7 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, Wyoming

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

1:1 ↔:47 ↓:3

2-C Analysis: **New Mexico**

🕖 State Partly Meets Goal 🛛 🧲 Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Although it does not place restrictions on usage, New Mexico limits the providers of its alternate routes.

New Mexico is commended for having no restrictions on the usage of its alternate routes with regard to subject, grade or geographic areas.

The state only permits institutions of higher education to provide alternate route programs. Alternate route providers are required to meet the same accreditation standards as traditional preparation programs.

Supporting Research New Mexico Administrative Code 6.60.3.2; 3.7

RECOMMENDATION

Encourage diversity of alternate route providers.

New Mexico should specifically authorize alternate route programs run by local school districts and nonprofits, as well as institutions of higher education. A good diversity of providers helps all programs, both university- and nonuniversity-based, to improve.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico stated that it allows institutions of higher education and districts to create an alternative route by using a system of rigorous evaluation. The NMTEACH evaluation system will provide a mechanism for determining licensure of these candidates.

Figure 49	,	OCRAPHICAREAS	
Are states' alternate	U V	SRAL SRAL	
routes free from	500	O L	
limitations?	BROA SUBIFC	DIVERSI	
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona	*	*	
Arkansas		*	
California	*	*	
Colorado	*	*	
Connecticut	*	*	
Delaware	* * * * * * *	*	
District of Columbia	*	*	
Florida	*	*	
Georgia	*	*	
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois	*	*	
Indiana	÷	*	
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky	*	*	
Louisiana	*	*	
Maine			
Maryland	*	*	
Massachusetts	*	*	
Michigan		*	
Minnesota	*		
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana	*		
Nebraska			
Nevada		*	
New Hampshire	*	*	
New Jersey	*		
NEW MEXICO	🔶 🗎		
New York	*	*	
North Carolina	*	*	
North Dakota	*		
Ohio	*	*	
Oklahoma		*	
Oregon			
Pennsylvania		*	
Rhode Island	*		
South Carolina		*	
South Dakota			
Tennessee	+	•	
Texas		→	
Utah	□ ★ ★ ★	Ê	
Vermont			
Virginia		★	
Washington	÷.	÷	
West Virginia		4	
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
For some alternate routes	For most or most widely used alternate routes	★ For all alternate rout	2:

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Twenty-three states meet this goal, and although NCTQ has not singled out one state's policies for "best practice" honors, it commends all states that pemit both broad usage and a diversity of providers for their alternate routes.

Figure 50

Do states provide real alternative pathways to certification?



1. Strong Practice: Connecticut, Florida, New Jersey, Rhode Island

2. Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia

3. Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming

ONC.	MCE MCE	-	/	*	× /	/	/	0	
ORMIN	OF SUB	of rest	SEMO	SFILL	0	HI I	DAT	Viao.	DIVERSITY OF PROVIDERS
PERF	NO	E SA	jour a	50	BLE		E MEI	² ²	Je be
MIC	R KY	ABIL DPTIC	12	TAT O	Nov Nov	TICE	Nerry	L'SA	
SRER CADI	VERIL	4141	FICH	ELEL	ROG	PR4C	WTE	^r O4c	VERS
र्षे /		×0 /		77 J		_	_		
	_		_				_	_	
									*
									*
									*
				_					*
	_								*
									÷
	-								÷
							_		÷
			-	-					÷
			_				_		
									*
									÷
_			_	_			_	_	
					_				*
							Ê		*
				*		*		*	*
	*	*		*		*		*	*
*	*	*				*		*	*
*	*	*			*			*	
	*	*	*	*	*				
							*		
								*	
			*			*			
					*				*
								*	*
*	*		*	*	*		*		
							*		*
		*						*	*
									*
									*
									*
									*
								_	*
									*
									*
									*
									*
									*

⊿ For some alternate routes 📕 For most or most widely used alternate routes 🔺 For all alternate routes

Area 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool

Goal D – Part-Time Teaching Licenses

The state should offer a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part time.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- Either through a discrete license or by waiving most licensure requirements, the state should license individuals with content expertise as part-time instructors.
- 2. All candidates for a part-time teaching license should be required to pass a subject-matter test.
- Other requirements for this license should be limited to those addressing public safety (e.g., background screening) and those of immediate use to the novice instructor (e.g., classroom management training).

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 52

How States are Faring in Part Time Teaching Licenses



Best Practice State Georgia

- 2 States Meet Goal Arkansas, Florida
 - States Nearly Meet Goal Kentucky, Michigan↑, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah
- 1
- **3** States Partly Meet Goal California, Louisiana, Oklahoma
- 10 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Colorado, Kansas, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New York, Pennsylvania¹, Washington, Wisconsin

28 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, NEW MEXICO, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

1:2 ↔:49 ↓:0

2-D Analysis: New Mexico

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico does not offer a license with minimal requirements that would allow content experts to teach part time.

RECOMMENDATION

Offer a license that allows content experts to serve as part-time instructors.

New Mexico should permit individuals with deep subject-area knowledge to teach a limited number of courses without fulfilling a complete set of certification requirements. The state should verify content knowledge through a rigorous test and conduct background checks as appropriate, while waiving all other licensure requirements. Such a license would increase districts' flexibility to staff certain subjects, including many STEM areas, that are frequently hard to staff or may not have high enough enrollment to necessitate a full-time position.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

		1	1
Do statos offor a liconso		Restricted or vague	
Do states offer a license		L vage	. /
with minimal requirements		ffere	/
that allows content experts to teach part-time?	S	stric ¹ se	
to teach part-time!	YES	lice.	No.
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
NEW MEXICO			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	10	12	29

T EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE

Georgia offers a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part time. Individuals seeking this license must pass a subject-matter test and will be assigned a mentor.

Area 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool

Goal E – Licensure Reciprocity

The state should help to make licenses fully portable among states, with appropriate safeguards.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should offer a standard license to fully certified teachers moving from other states, without relying on transcript analysis or recency requirements as a means of judging eligibility. The state can and should require evidence of effective teaching in previous employment.
- The state should uphold its standards for all teachers by insisting that certified teachers coming from other states meet its own testing requirements.
- 3. The state should accord the same license to teachers from other states who completed an approved alternate route program as it accords teachers prepared in a traditional preparation program.
- 4. Consistent with these principles of portability, state requirements for online teachers based in other states should protect student interests without creating unnecessary obstacles for teachers.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 54

How States are Faring in Licensure Reciprocity **Best Practice States** 2 Alabama, Texas States Meet Goal North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island States Nearly Meet Goal Delaware 1, Indiana 1, Oklahoma 1, Washington, Wisconsin 22 States Partly Meet Goal Alaska, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho4, Illinois, Iowa¹, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming 12 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Hawaii, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, NEW MEXICO, South Carolina States Do Not Meet Goal 7 California, District of Columbia, Kansas, Kentucky, Nevada, New Jersey, Vermont Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:5 ➡:45 ↓:1

2-E Analysis: **New Mexico**



Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Regrettably, New Mexico grants a waiver for its licensing tests to any out-of-state teacher who has passed a test in a previous state, regardless of whether or not he or she has met standards comparable to New Mexico's passing scores on its own tests.

Teachers with valid out-of-state certificates are eligible for a New Mexico teaching license. The state determines the type of reciprocated license on the basis of the out-of-state teacher's years of experience. Those with fewer than three years of experience receive a level 1 license; those with three to five years receive a level 2 license; and those with six or more years and a master's degree get a level 3 license.

Transcripts are required for all out-of-state teachers. However, it is not clear whether the state analyzes transcripts to determine whether a teacher was prepared through a traditional or alternate route or whether additional coursework will be required.

Although New Mexico requires online teachers working for its Cyber Academy to meet its academic content and performance standards, it is not clear whether teachers outside New Mexico are required to meet the state's certification requirements.

Supporting Research New Mexico Administrative Code 6.60.4.8,-.9

RECOMMENDATION

To uphold standards, require that teachers coming from other states meet testing requirements.

New Mexico takes considerable risk by granting a waiver for its licensing tests to any out-of-state teacher who has passed a test in another state. It should not provide any waivers of its teacher tests unless an applicant can provide evidence of a passing score under its own standards. The negative impact on student learning stemming from a teacher's inadequate subject-matter knowledge is not mitigated by the teacher's having met another state's testing requirements.

Offer a standard license to certified out-of-state teachers, absent unnecessary requirements.

New Mexico should consider adopting a more flexible policy regarding portability and offer outof-state teachers comparable licensure, not one based on years of experience, as this may deter talented teachers from applying for certification in New Mexico.

Accord the same license to out-of-state alternate route teachers as would be accorded to traditionally prepared teachers.

New Mexico should consider discontinuing its requirement for the submission of transcripts. Transcript analysis is likely to result in additional coursework requirements, even for traditionally prepared teachers; alternate route teachers, on the other hand, may have to virtually begin anew, repeating some, most or all of a teacher preparation program in New Mexico.

Require evidence of effective teaching when determining eligibility for full certification.

Rather than rely on transcripts to assess credentials, New Mexico should instead require that evidence of teacher effectiveness be considered for all out-of-state candidates. Such evidence is especially important for candidates who come from states that make student growth at least a significant factor of a teacher evaluation (see Goal 3-B).

Ensure that requirements for online teachers are as rigorous as those for in-state teachers.

New Mexico should ensure that online teachers based in other states are at least equally as qualified as those who teach in the state. However, New Mexico should balance the interests of its students in having qualified online instructors with making certain that these requirements do not create unnecessary obstacles for out-of-state teachers.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.



Do states require all out-of-state teachers to pass their licensure tests?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska³, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine⁴, Massachusetts³, Minnesota, New York⁵, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas³, Utah, Washington⁶, Wisconsin
- 2. Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana⁷, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 3. Allows one year to meet testing requirements.
- 4. Maine grants waiver for basic skills and pedagogy tests.
- 5. Waiver for teachers with National Board Certification; all others given two years to meet testing requirements.
- 6. Waiver for teachers with National Board Certification.
- 7. No subject-matter testing for any teacher certification.

- 1. State conducts transcript reviews.
- 2. Recency requirement is for alternate route.
- 3. For traditionally prepared teachers only.
- 4. Teachers with less than 3 years' experience are subject to transcript review.

Figure 56		HIM /	5
	UCENSE RECIPROCITY	Submission of trans	Recency requiements
What do states require of	RECIPR	on of tr	equirer.
teachers transferring from	VSE TRIV	nissi	154
other states?	NOS	Subr	Rece
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut Delaware			
Detaware District of Columbia		1	
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa		1	2 ²
Kansas		1	
Kentucky		1	
Louisiana			
Maine		1	
Maryland			
Massachusetts		1	
Michigan			
Minnesota		1	
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
NEW MEXICO			
New York	3		
North Carolina			
North Dakota		_ '	
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon		1	
Pennsylvania Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont		1	
Virginia			
Washington	4		
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming	3		
	6	44	11
	0	44	

Figure 57		State Specific different	ate ate
Do states treat out-of-state	EAC	DLESS	alterr es wij creat
teachers the same whether	STATE TREATS TEAC	S for	rs di polici ial to rs lte
they were prepared in a	LYR	Speci meni act	these for the stand
traditional or an alternate	TA TA PUAL	State State quire te te	State the po bstac
route program?	PREFS	^o ^s ^s ^o	185
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
NEW MEXICO			
New York			
North Carolina North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	4	-	41
	4	6	41

EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Alabama and Texas appropriately support licensure reciprocity by requiring that certified teachers from other states meet Alabama's and Texas's own testing requirements, and by not specifying any additional coursework or recency requirements to determine eligibility for either traditional or alternate route teachers. Also worthy of mention is Delaware for its reciprocity policy that limits the evidence of "successful" experience it will accept to evaluation results from states with rigorous requirements similar to its own.


Area 3 Summary

How States are Faring in Identifying Effective Teachers

State Area Grades



Topics Included In This Area

- 3-A: State Data Systems
- 3-B: Evaluation of Effectiveness
- **3-C: Frequency of Evaluations**

- 3-D: Tenure
- 3-E: Licensure Advancement
- 3-F: Equitable Distribution

Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers

Goal A – State Data Systems

The state should have a data system that contributes some of the evidence needed to assess teacher effectiveness.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

1. The state should establish a longitudinal data system with at least the following key components:

a. A unique statewide student identifier number that connects student data across key databases across years;

b. A unique teacher identifier system that can match individual teacher records with individual student records and

c. An assessment system that can match individual student test records from year to year in order to measure academic growth.

- Student growth or value-added data provided through the state's longitudinal data system should be considered among the criteria used to determine teachers' effectiveness.
- 3. To ensure that data provided through the state data system is actionable and reliable, the state should have a clear definition of "teacher of record" and require its consistent use statewide.
- 4. Data provided through the state's longitudinal data system should be used to publicly report information on teacher production.



Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 58

How States are Faring in State Data Systems



Best Practice States Hawaii, New York

States Meet Goal

- 0
 - 19 States Nearly Meet Goal Arizona¹, Arkansas, Connecticut¹, Delaware, District of Columbia¹, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan¹, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, Texas¹, Washington, Wyoming



25 States Partly Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska , California , Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana , Nebraska, Nevada , New Hampshire, New Jersey , NEW MEXICO, North Dakota, Oregon , South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont , Virginia , West Virginia, Wisconsin

2

States Meet a Small Part of Goal Colorado, Pennsylvania

3 States Do Not Meet Goal Maine, Oklahoma , South Dakota

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

↑:13 ↔:36 ↓:2



ANALYSIS

New Mexico has a data system with the capacity to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness.

New Mexico has all three necessary elements of a student- and teacher-level longitudinal data system. The state has assigned unique student identifiers that connect student data across key databases across years and has assigned unique teacher identifiers that enable it to match individual teacher records with individual student records. It also has the capacity to match student test records from year to year in order to measure student academic growth.

New Mexico defines teacher of record as the primary instructor for a particular course or class. The state's teacher-student data link can connect more than one educator to a particular student in a given course, and it does have in place a process for teacher roster verification.

New Mexico does not publish data on teacher production that connects program completion, certification and hiring statistics.

Supporting Research Data Quality Campaign www.dataqualitycampaign.org

RECOMMENDATION

Develop a definition of "teacher of record" that can be used to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness.

To ensure that data provided through the state data system are actionable and reliable, New Mexico should articulate a definition of teacher of record and require its consistent use throughout the state. The state's definition should reflect instruction rather than grading.

Publish data on teacher production.

From the number of teachers who graduate from preparation programs each year, only a subset are certified, and only some of those certified are actually hired in the state. While it is certainly desirable to produce a big enough pool to give districts a choice in hiring, the substantial oversupply in some teaching areas is not good for the profession. New Mexico should look to Maryland's "Teacher Staffing Report" as a model whose primary purpose is to determine teacher shortage areas, while also identifying areas of surplus. By collecting similar hiring data from its districts, New Mexico will form a rich set of data that can inform policy decisions.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Do states' data systems have the basic elements needed to assess teacher effectiveness: unique teacher and student identifiers that can be matched to test records over time?



1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

2. Colorado, Maine, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota

Figure 60

Do states' data systems include more advanced elements needed to assess teacher effectiveness?



Figure 61		Some data published L.	8
De states for als		DUCT	No related data published
Do states track	Rph	Director	^{strict}
teacher production?	ACHE	usht tapu	data,
	ME TE A PUB	me de	elateg
	14 105	3 E	Non
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana Iowa			
iowa Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
NEW MEXICO			
New York			
North Carolina North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	6	8	37

EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Hawaii and New York have all three necessary elements of a student- and teacher-level longitudinal data system. Both states have developed definitions of "teacher of record" that reflect instruction. Their data links can connect multiple teachers to a particular student, and there is a process for teacher roster verification. In addition, Hawaii and New York publish teacher production data. Also worthy of mention is Maryland for its "Teacher Staffing Report," which serves as a model for other states. The report's primary purpose is to determine teacher shortage areas, while also identifying areas of surplus.

Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers

Goal B – Evaluation of Effectiveness

The state should require instructional effectiveness to be the preponderant criterion of any teacher evaluation.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should either require a common evaluation instrument in which evidence of student learning is the most significant criterion or should specifically require that student learning be the preponderant criterion in local evaluation processes. Evaluation instruments, whether state or locally developed, should be structured so as to preclude a teacher from receiving a satisfactory rating if found ineffective in the classroom.
- 2. Evaluation instruments should require classroom observations that focus on and document the effectiveness of instruction.
- 3. The state should encourage the use of student surveys, which have been shown to correlate strongly with teacher effectiveness.
- 4. The state should require that evaluation instruments differentiate among various levels of teacher performance. A binary system that merely categorizes teachers as satisfactory or unsatisfactory is inadequate.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 62

How States are Faring in Evaluation of Effectiveness



Best Practice States

19 States Meet Goal Alaska¹, Colorado, Connecticut¹, Delaware, Florida, Georgia¹, Hawaii¹, Louisiana¹, Michigan, Mississippi 1, Nevada, NEW MEXICO¹, North Carolina¹, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania¹, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Wisconsin

States Nearly Meet Goal Arizona, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Virginia

16 States Partly Meet Goal Arkansas, District of Columbia 1, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas¹, Kentucky¹, Maine¹, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri 1, Oregon¹, South Carolina¹, South Dakota¹, Utah, West Virginia¹, Wyoming¹



States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alabama, California, Idaho, Iowa 1, Nebraska, Texas, Washington

States Do Not Meet Goal 4 Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

★:22 ↔:27 **!**:2



ANALYSIS

Commendably, New Mexico requires that objective evidence of student learning be the preponderant criterion of its teacher evaluations. By school year 2013-2014, districts must develop teacher evaluations based on a new effectiveness system and submit to the state for approval.

Evaluation plans must include measures of student achievement growth worth 50 percent. Plans must also include a mechanism to examine effectiveness data from multiple sources, which may include parent and student input.

For teachers who teach a grade or subject with a standards-based assessment, the student achievement growth component must be comprised of the standard-based assessment (35 percent) and additional department-approved assessments (15 percent). For teachers without standards-based assessments, the student achievement growth component must be comprised of valid and reliable data and indicators of student achievement growth assessed annually on district-selected and department-approved assessments.

Five levels of performance must be used: exemplary, meets competency; highly effective, meets competency; effective, meets competency; minimally effective, does not meet competency; and ineffective, does not meet competency.

Classroom observations are required.

Supporting Research 6.69.8 NMAC

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Do states consider	
classroom effectiveness	
as part of teacher	
evaluations?	

Figure 63	REQURES THAT STUDENT ACHELENEWNTGROUDENT PREPONDERATION	Requires then student defines then student driven the student strenting bowth is a signifi-	Requires that student scherement student withour care of owner is	Requires come object	Sudent aching - une evidence Sudent achievement daa not equired
Do states consider	STUE	Requires that Student achieventent Student criterion (explicity defic, a s	Requires that student achievement student 's'gnifcant' critic over is c	etine.	une da
classroom effectiveness	HAL	VTC STOWN STOWN	at sti	t Bulio	Verne Verne
	PES T ENEN	s than Tent i	Tes th menu	som som	achie ed ie
as part of teacher		squire lieven rion (Requi hieve mifice	Tuires Uden	dent. Pequir
evaluations?	A C A B	at Re	h sis With	Requires some object	Student achie Noc required
Alabama					1
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					1
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey NEW MEXICO					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					1
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia		2			
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	19	7	9	6	10
	15		5	Ū	.0

1. The state has an ESEA waiver requiring an evaluation system that includes student achievement as a significant factor. However, no specific guidelines or policies have been articulated.

2. Explicitly defined for the 2013-2014 school year.

Figure 64			/	Type of surrey.	ed
<i>Is survey data used as part</i>					Suneys not permitted
of teacher evaluations?	e) s	*	. /		ermin
·	it sur	Surve	"hells	Surve	s not
	Student surveys	Parent surveys	Peer surveys)pe o	<i>where</i>
	°, /	1		~,	/ °,
Alabama					
Alaska ¹					
Arizona Arkansas				2 2	
California					
Colorado	2	2	2		
Connecticut ³					
Delaware					
District of Columbia	2	2			
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa ¹ Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine			2		
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota	2				
Mississippi	2				
Missouri	2	2	2		
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
New Hampshire New Jersey					
NEW MEXICO	2	2			
New York	2	2			
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	14	11	6	2	33

Figure 65

Do states require more than two categories for teacher evaluation ratings?



 Strong Practice: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Despectivenza, Bhade Island, Scuth Carolina, Chio, Scuth Despectatore Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

2. Alabama, California, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont

1. Input from students, teachers and peers is required, but there is no explicit indication that this must come from surveys.

2. Explicitly allowed but not required.

3. Requires parent or peer surveys; whole-school student learning or student surveys.

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

NCTQ has not singled out any one state for "best practice" honors. Many states continue to make significant strides in the area of teacher evaluation by requiring that objective evidence of student learning be the preponderant criterion. Because there are many different approaches that result in student learning being the preponderant criterion, all 19 states that meet this goal are commended for their efforts.

Figure 66		Defamption	District-designed evaluation 9xten consistent with state frame work criteria with state
Do states direct how		uatio, e opt-	hatio h stat
teachers should be	~ /	e eva	d eva 11 wii
evaluated?	^e wide Vsten	e stat vith p	ssigne Tsiste, criter,
evaluated?	state tion 5	Tipti, Ticts u	ict-de m Cont
	Single Valua	Presul in dist	Dist Syste ame
Alahama	Sige statewide evaluation 39stern	-20 /	4
Alabama Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			1
New Jersey			
NEW MEXICO			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	9	12	30

1. New Hampshire is in the process of developing a state model/criteria for teacher evaluations.

Figure 67		/	EVALUATORS MUST PR	HERS
What requirements have	MULTIPLE EVALUATOR	EVALUATOR TRAIN	0	EVALUATOR CENTRICATE
states established for	28		157	
evaluators?	NAL.	2 TRA	RS N SA	EF EF
	PLE L	410	IEN.	470g
	NUL) BSER	NALL,	AVE	אורו
Alabama	< 0 ⁻	/ 4/		
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois				
Indiana				
lowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
Maryland	1			
Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi	2			
Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey				
NEW MEXICO	2			
New York				
North Carolina				
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania Dha da lalar d				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia				
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
	4	34	3	13

Maryland requires multiple observers for ineffective teachers.
Multiple evaluators are explicitly allowed but not required.

Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers

Goal C – Frequency of Evaluations

The state should require annual evaluations of all teachers.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require that all teachers receive a formal evaluation rating each year.
- 2. While all teachers should have multiple observations that contribute to their formal evaluation rating, the state should ensure that new teachers are observed and receive feedback early in the school year.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 68



3-C Analysis: **New Mexico**

ANALYSIS

New Mexico now requires annual evaluations for all teachers.

Beginning with the 2014-2015 school year, each teacher must either be observed three times by the same certified observer, or two times, with one observation by each of two different certified observers.

New Mexico does not articulate when these observations should occur.

Supporting Research 6.69.8.8, -.11 NMAC

RECOMMENDATION

Ensure that new teachers are observed and receive feedback early in the school year.

It is critical that schools and districts closely monitor the performance of new teachers. New Mexico should ensure that its new teachers get the support they need, and that supervisors know early on which new teachers may be struggling or at risk for unacceptable levels of performance.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Do states require districts to evaluate all teachers each year?



1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland³, Mississippi, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

2. Alaska, Arkansas, California, District of Columbia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Virginia

3. Regulations sunset on September 30, 2014.

Figure 70

Figure 70	ANNUAL EVALUATION OF ALL VETERAN, TOON	AMULAL EVALUATION OF ALL PROBATIONARY TEACHERS
Do states require districts	Å0	ON CONC
to evaluate all teachers	(NAT	VARY
each year?	EVAL TERA	EVAL 1101
eddir yedir	NUAL VLAL	NUAL PROB
	A C A	ALL A
Alabama		
Alaska		
Arizona		
Arkansas		
California		
Colorado		
Connecticut		
Delaware		
District of Columbia		
Florida		
Georgia		
Hawaii		
Idaho		
Illinois		
Indiana		
lowa		
Kansas		
Kentucky		
Louisiana		
Maine		
Maryland		
Massachusetts		
Michigan		
Minnesota		
Mississippi Missouri		
Montana		
Nebraska		
Nevada		
New Hampshire		
New Jersey		
NEW MEXICO		
New York		
North Carolina		
North Dakota		
Ohio		
Oklahoma		
Oregon		
Pennsylvania		
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
South Dakota		
Tennessee		
Texas		
Utah		
Vermont		
Virginia		
Washington		
West Virginia		
Wisconsin		
Wyoming		
	28	44

Figure 71

Do states require multiple classroom observations?



1. Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington

 Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin

3. California, District of Columbia, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Wyoming

Figure 72

What is the determining factor for frequency of observations?



1. Alabama, District of Columbia⁶, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Rhode Island

2. Alaska, Arkansas⁷, California⁷, Colorado, Florida, Kansas⁷, Minnesota⁷, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oklahoma⁷, Oregon, Pennsylvania⁷, South Carolina, South Dakota⁷, Utah⁷, Washington, West Virginia⁸

- 3. Louisiana, Michigan, Ohio
- 4. Arizona⁹, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts⁷, Nevada, Tennessee, Texas⁷, Virginia⁷, Wisconsin⁷
- 5. Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming
- 6. Depends on LEA requirements.
- 7. Frequency is based on evaluation cycle, not year.
- 8. No observations required after year 5.
- 9. Second observation may be waived for tenured teachers with high performance on first observation.

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

NCTQ is not awarding "best practice" honors for frequency of evaluations but commends **Alabama**, **Hawaii**, **Idaho**, **Mississippi**, **New Jersey**, **Tennessee** and **Washington**. These states not only require annual evaluations and multiple observations for all teachers, but they also ensure that new teachers are observed and receive feedback during the first half of the school year.

Figure 73

Do states require that new teachers are observed early in the year?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota³, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia
- Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia⁴, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. New teachers must be evaluated early in the year; observations not explicit.
- 4. Teachers in their first year are informally evaluated early in the year.

Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers

Goal D – Tenure

The state should require that tenure decisions are based on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- A teacher should be eligible for tenure after a certain number of years of service, but tenure should not be granted automatically at that juncture.
- 2. Evidence of effectiveness should be the preponderant criterion in tenure decisions.
- 3. The minimum years of service needed to achieve tenure should allow sufficient data to be accumulated on which to base tenure decisions; four to five years is the ideal minimum.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 74 How States are Faring in Tenure **Best Practice States** 2 Connecticut¹, Michigan 3 States Meet Goal Colorado, Florida, Louisiana 1 States Nearly Meet Goal 7 Delaware, Hawaii 1, Nevada, New Jersey 1, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee States Partly Meet Goal 7 Arizona¹, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina¹, Virginia¹ States Meet a Small Part of Goal 7 Idaho, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, Ohio, Washington 25 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, District of Columbia, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, NEW MEXICO, North Dakota, Oregon,

Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin,

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

👄 : 44

Wyoming

1:7

🦊 : O

3-D Analysis: New Mexico

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico does not connect tenure decisions to evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Teachers in New Mexico are awarded tenure automatically after a three-year probationary period, absent an additional process that evaluates cumulative evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Supporting Research New Mexico Code 22-10A-7; 22-10A-10; 22-10A-11

RECOMMENDATION

End the automatic awarding of tenure.

The decision to grant tenure should be a deliberate one, based on consideration of a teacher's commitment and actual evidence of classroom effectiveness.

Ensure evidence of effectiveness is the preponderant criterion in tenure decisions.

New Mexico should make evidence of effectiveness, rather than the number of years in the classroom, the most significant factor when determining this leap in professional standing.

Articulate a process that local districts must administer when deciding which teachers get tenure.

New Mexico should require a clear process, such as a hearing, to ensure that the local district reviews a teacher's performance before making a determination regarding tenure.

Require a longer probationary period.

New Mexico should extend its probationary period, ideally to five years. This would allow sufficient time to collect data that adequately reflect teacher performance.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 75		/	/	/	/	/	/
<i>How long before a teacher earns tenure?</i>							STATE ONLY A WARDS ANNUAL CONTRACTS
	2		/			/	SWLY.
	No Policy	⁷ Year	² Y _{ears}	³ Jears	4 YEARS	5 YEARS	STATE ANNUAL
Alabama							
Alaska							
Arizona Arkansas							
California							
Colorado							
Connecticut							
Delaware							
District of Columbia							
Florida							
Georgia							
Hawaii							
Idaho				1			
Illinois							
Indiana Iowa							
Kansas							
Kentucky							
Louisiana							
Maine							
Maryland							
Massachusetts							
Michigan							
Minnesota							
Mississippi							
Missouri							
Montana Nebraska							
Nevada							
New Hampshire							
New Jersey							
NEW MEXICO							
New York							
North Carolina							2
North Dakota							
Ohio						3	
Oklahoma				4		Ц	
Oregon							
Pennsylvania Rhode Island							5
South Carolina							
South Dakota							
Tennessee							
Texas							
Utah							
Vermont							
Virginia				6			
Washington				7			
West Virginia							
Wisconsin Wyoming							
ttyoning							
	1	1	4	32	4	6	3

- 1. Idaho limits teacher contract terms to one year.
- 2. A teacher can receive up to a 4-year contract if deemed proficient on evaluation.
- 3. Teachers must hold an educator license for at least seven years and have taught in the district at least three of the last five years.
- 4. Teachers may also earn career status with an average rating of at least effective for a four-year period and a rating of at least effective for the last two years.
- 5. While technically not on annual contracts, Rhode Island teachers who receive two years of ineffective ratings are dismissed.
- 6. Local school board may extend up to five years.
- 7. At a district's discretion, a teacher may be granted tenure after the second year if he/she receives one of the top two evaluation ratings.

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Connecticut and Michigan appropriately base tenure decisions on evidence of teacher effectiveness. In Connecticut, tenure is awarded after four years and must be earned on the basis of effective practice as demonstrated in evaluation ratings. Michigan requires a probationary period of five years, with teachers having to earn a rating of effective or highly effective on their three most recent performance evaluations. Both states require that student growth be the preponderant criterion of teacher evaluations.

Figure 76	EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING STUDENT PREPONDERMANTHE	3	/
How are tenure	DENT	TERIC Idense	
decisions made?	E STU	Est S	ered tically
Gecisions made:	FOF SAM	ence onsio	toma
		^e evio B is c	ly au
	REPC	Som	Virtua .
Alabama	₹° /	Some evidence of studen.	Virtually automatically
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida	1		
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
NEW MEXICO			
New York			
North Carolina		2	
North Dakota Ohio			
Oklahoma	3		
Oregon Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	11	9	31
		9	

1. Florida only awards annual contracts.

- 2. North Carolina has recently eliminated tenure. The state requires some evidence of effectiveness in awarding multipleyear contracts.
- 3. Oklahoma has created a loophole by essentially waiving student learning requirements and allowing the principal of a school to petition for career-teacher status.

Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers

Goal E – Licensure Advancement

The state should base licensure advancement on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should base advancement from a probationary to a nonprobationary license on evidence of effectiveness.
- 2. The state should not require teachers to fulfill generic, unspecified coursework requirements to advance from a probationary to a nonprobationary license.
- 3. The state should not require teachers to have an advanced degree as a condition of professional licensure.
- 4. Evidence of effectiveness should be a factor in the renewal of a professional licenses.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy



3-E Analysis: **New Mexico**

State Meets a Small Part of Goal

⊖ Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico requires some evidence of teacher effectiveness in licensing and advancement policies.

New Mexico has a three-tiered licensure system. To advance from a Level I Teaching license to a Level II Teaching license, teachers are required to complete three years' teaching experience, fulfill the mentoring requirement and submit either a Professional Development Dossier (PDD) or National Board of Professional Teaching Standards certification. The PDD includes evidence divided into five strands, which include "evidence of teacher effectiveness" and "evidence of student learning." Specific examples of acceptable evidence are included for each strand. To advance, teachers must meet or exceed the standards in all five strands.

The state also offers a Level III-A license, which requires an advanced degree. Teachers, however, are not required to advance past the Level II certification. New Mexico requires teachers to demonstrate effectiveness as a factor in the renewal of same-level license. Each year, all teachers must demonstrate how they meet the competencies and indicators for their licensure level through an individual Professional Development Plan and Annual Evaluation.

Supporting Research

http://teachnm.org/experienced-teachers.html http://teachnm.org/uploads/docs/3_tier_presentation.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

Require evidence of effectiveness as a part of teacher licensing policy.

New Mexico commendably requires evidence of teacher effectiveness and evidence of student learning for licensure advancement and renewal. However, it is not clear if this evidence must be in the form of objective measures of student achievement to be a factor in determining whether teachers earn advanced licenses.

End requirement tying teacher advancement to master's degrees.

New Mexico should remove its mandate that teachers obtain a master's degree for license advancement. Research is conclusive and emphatic that master's degrees do not have any significant correlation to classroom performance. Rather, advancement should be based on evidence of teacher effectiveness.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 78	OBIECTIVE ENDENCE OF			
Do states require teachers	ć	Some objective evidence	Consideration given to performance performance to class that the second	Performance not considered
to show evidence of	NCF.	REQ. îdeni	"iven	nside
effectiveness before	SC 10	iveel 202	form	s not a
conferring professional	VEN	bject	sidera er pei	men men
licensure?	BIEC	onsio		tom to
	0 == 1	Some objective is considered	~ ~ ~	e b
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
District of Columbia				
Florida				
Georgia				
Hawaii				
Idaho		2		
Illinois				
Indiana Iowa				
lowa Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana				
Maine				
Maryland		3		
Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi				
Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey				
NEW MEXICO				
New York				
North Carolina				
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah			Ц	
Vermont				
Virginia				
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
	6	4	9	32

1. Evidence of effectiveness is required for license renewal but not for conferring of professional license.

2. Illinois allows revocation of licenses based on ineffectiveness.

3. Maryland uses some objective evidence through their evaluation systems for renewal, but advancement to professional license is still based on earning an advanced degree.

Do states require teachers to earn advanced degrees before conferring professional licensure?

NEW MEXICO 29 NO¹ Required for Option for Required mandatory professional for optional professional license or advanced license² encouraged by license^₄ state policy³

- Strong Practice: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 2. Connecticut, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, Montana, New York and Oregon all require a master's degree or coursework equivalent to a master's degree.
- 3. Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri
- 4. Alabama, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Ohio, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia

Figure 80

Do states require teachers to take additional coursework before conferring or renewing professional licenses?



- 1. Strong Practice: Hawaii, Louisiana, New Jersey, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Tennessee
- 2. Strong Practice: California, Georgia, Minnesota
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina⁴, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyorning
- 4. Some required coursework is targeted.

Do states award lifetime licenses?



- Strong Practice: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut³, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 2. New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia
- 3. Although teachers in Connecticut must renew their licenses every five years, there are no requirements for renewal.

T EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE

Rhode Island is integrating certification, certification renewal and educator evaluations. Teachers who receive poor evaluations for five consecutive years are not eligible to renew their licenses. In addition, teachers who consistently receive "highly effective" ratings will be eligible for a special license designation.

Area 3: Identifying Effective Teachers

Goal F – Equitable Distribution

The state should publicly report districts' distribution of teacher talent among schools to identify inequities in schools serving disadvantaged children.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should make aggregate school-level data about teacher performance —from an evaluation system based on instructional effectiveness as described in Goal 3-B publicly available.
- 2. In the absence of such an evaluation system, the state should make the following data publicly available:

a. An "Academic Quality" index for each school that includes factors research has found to be associated with teacher effectiveness such as:

- percentage of new teachers;
- percentage of teachers failing basic skills licensure tests at least once;
- percentage of teachers on emergency credentials:
- average selectivity of teachers' undergraduate institutions and
- teachers' average ACT or SAT scores

b. The percentage of highly qualified teachers disaggregated by both individual school and by teaching area.

c. The annual teacher absenteeism rate reported for the previous three years, disaggregated by individual school.

d. The average teacher turnover rate for the previous three years, disaggregated by individual school, by district and by reasons that teachers leave.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 82



3-F Analysis: New Mexico

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

Providing comprehensive reporting may be the state's most important role for ensuring the equitable distribution of teachers among schools. New Mexico reports little school-level data that can help support the equitable distribution of teacher talent.

New Mexico does not require districts to publicly report aggregate school-level data about teacher performance, nor does the state collect and publicly report most of the other data recommended by NCTQ. New Mexico does not provide a school-level teacher-quality index that demonstrates the academic backgrounds of a school's teachers and the ratio of new to veteran teachers. The state also does not report on teacher absenteeism or turnover rates.

Based on state-mandated requirements, districts are required to report the following information at the district level: the percentage of teachers on emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of highly qualified teachers. New Mexico also compares the percentages for both factors at high- and low-poverty schools. However, these data were not reported on the most recent 2012 district report cards.

Supporting Research

District Report Card Requirements http://www.ped.state.nm.us/AssessmentAccountability/AcademicGrowth/dl11/Memo-reportcards.pdf

2012 School Report Card

http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx

District Accountability Reports

http://webapp.ped.state.nm.us/aypdl/docs/2010/046_000_ALAMOGORDO_PUBLIC_SCHOOLS_AYP1011_20100802_0952.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

Report school-level teacher effectiveness data.

New Mexico should make aggregate school-level data about teacher performance—from an evaluation system based on instructional effectiveness—publicly available. Given that New Mexico requires teacher evaluations to be based to a significant extent on evidence of student learning (see Goal 3-B), such data about the effectiveness of a school's teachers can shine a light on how equitably teachers are distributed across and within school districts.

Publish other data that facilitate comparisons across schools.

New Mexico should collect and report other school-level data that reflect the stability of a school's faculty, including the rates of teacher absenteeism and turnover.

Provide comparative data based on school demographics.

As New Mexico does with emergency credentials and highly qualified teachers, the state should provide comparative data for schools with similar poverty and minority populations. This would yield a more comprehensive picture of gaps in the equitable distribution of teachers.

Ensure that data are current.

It is important to keep data updated and current in order to provide the public with an accurate picture of teacher distribution across schools in districts. New Mexico should ensure that districts adhere to the requirements for their report cards, as highly qualified teacher data has not been available on district report cards since 2009.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

Figure 83		× /4	00	No.	HERS			•
Do states publicly report school-level data	PERCORMANCE DAT.	AN INDEX FOR EACH SQUE THAT INCLERE FOR EACH SQUE TEACOLATE: UDES FOR EACH SQUE	PERCENTAGE OF	PERENTAGE OF	PERCENTAGE OF HICK	ANNUAL TURA	TEACHER ABSENT	'EEISM BAL
about teachers?	MANCE FLANCE		SCALL R			Line Charl	4BSEN	
	PFORN CHER	14 INC 14 INC 14 INC 14 INC 14 INC	HER CENT	ENTA L	RCENT 4LIFIED	VUAL 7	CHER,	
	EA E	A F S F		PER	PE	AVI -	LEN.	
Alabama								
Alaska								
Arizona								
Arkansas California								
Colorado								
Connecticut								
Delaware								
District of Columbia								
Florida								
Georgia								
Hawaii								
Idaho								
Illinois								
Indiana								
lowa								
Kansas								
Kentucky								
Louisiana								
Maine								
Maryland								
Massachusetts								
Michigan								
Minnesota Missississi								
Mississippi Missouri								
Montana								
Nebraska								
Nevada								
New Hampshire								
New Jersey								
NEW MEXICO								
New York								
North Carolina								
North Dakota								
Ohio								
Oklahoma								
Oregon								
Pennsylvania								
Rhode Island								
South Carolina								
South Dakota								
Tennessee								
Texas								
Utah Vermont								
Virginia Washington								
West Virginia								
Wisconsin								
Wyoming								

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Although not awarding "best practice" honors for this goal, NCTQ commends the nine states that meet the goal for giving the public access to teacher performance data aggregated to the school level. This transparency can help shine a light on on how equitably teachers are distributed across and within school districts and help to ensure that all students have access to effective teachers.

Figure 84

Do states publicly report school-level data about teacher effectiveness?



- 1. Strong Practice: Arkansas³, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts⁴, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania
- 2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida⁵, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah⁵, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Reporting of teacher effectiveness data will begin in 2017.
- 4. Massachusetts' evaluation system is not based primarily on evidence of teacher effectiveness.
- 5. Reports data about teacher effectiveness at the district level.

Area 4 Summary



How States are Faring in Retaining Effective Teachers



Topics Included In This Area

- 4-A: Induction
- 4-B: Professional Development
- 4-C: Pay Scales

- 4-D: Compensation for Prior Work Experience
- 4-E: Differential Pay
- 4-F: Performance Pay

Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

Goal A – Induction

The state should require effective induction for all new teachers, with special emphasis on teachers in high-need schools.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should ensure that new teachers receive mentoring of sufficient frequency and duration, especially in the first critical weeks of school.
- 2. Mentors should be carefully selected based on evidence of their own classroom effectiveness and subject-matter expertise. Mentors should be trained, and their performance as mentors should be evaluated.
- Induction programs should include only strategies that can be successfully implemented, even in a poorly managed school. Such strategies include intensive mentoring, seminars appropriate to grade level or subject area, a reduced teaching load and frequent release time to observe effective teachers.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 85

How States are Faring in Induction **Best Practice State** 1 South Carolina 10 States Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Hawaii 1, Illinois 1, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Virginia 1 15 States Nearly Meet Goal California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, North Dakota¹, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Utah 11 States Partly Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, Kansas, NEW MEXICO, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin States Meet a Small Part of Goal Florida, Idaho, Montana 1, Texas 10 States Do Not Meet Goal District of Columbia, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: •:45 ↓:1 1:5

4-A Analysis: New Mexico



Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico requires that all of its new teachers receive mentoring. The state mandates that all new teachers participate in its mentoring program throughout their first year of employment and that mentors receive additional training. A regular review and evaluation process to assess the program's effective-ness is also mandatory. All other logistics are left to the local districts.

Supporting Research New Mexico Code 22-10A-9

RECOMMENDATION

Set more specific parameters.

To ensure that all teachers receive high-quality mentoring, New Mexico should set a timeline in which mentors are assigned to all new teachers throughout the state, soon after the commencing of teaching, to offer support during those first critical weeks of school. Mentors should be required to be trained in a content area or grade level similar to that of the new teacher, and to attract the most qualified participants to the mentor program, guaranteed compensation is also a wise inclusion.

Require induction strategies that can be successfully implemented, even in poorly managed schools.

To ensure that the experience is meaningful, New Mexico should make certain that induction includes strategies such as intensive mentoring, seminars appropriate to grade level or subject area and a reduced teaching load and/or frequent release time to observe other teachers.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico recognized the factual accuracy of this analysis.

			•	,		,			
Figure 86		MENTORING OF SUFERC	MENTORING PROJUCTION	47 YEAR	MENTORS MILES	NED	/ /	USE OF A VARETY OF EFFER	
Do states have policies that	MENTORING FOR ALL	Chero	Clean 1		NOF,	MENTORS / PROCRAME	Shin G	VPENS	t CIES
articulate the elements of	FOR			5 SC			LEN S		2
effective induction?	ACHE ACHE			l'Es	KS M	E EL	RSAR	TON S	
	EVT EWTE	FOUE	CINN CINN	AREFL	ENTC	TENT UST B	ENTO	0 3 3 3 3 3 3	
Alabama	< % /	~ & /	~ \ \	0	। २ 	~ 2 /	<u>ج</u>	~<	
Alaska									
Arizona									
Arkansas									
California									
Colorado									
Connecticut									
Delaware									
District of Columbia									
Florida									
Georgia									
Hawaii									
Idaho Illinois									
Illinois Indiana									
lowa									
Kansas									
Kentucky									
Louisiana									
Maine									
Maryland									
Massachusetts									
Michigan									
Minnesota									
Mississippi									
Missouri									
Montana									
Nebraska									
Nevada									
New Hampshire New Jersey									
NEW MEXICO									
New York									
North Carolina									
North Dakota									
Ohio									
Oklahoma									
Oregon									
Pennsylvania									
Rhode Island									
South Carolina									
South Dakota									
Tennessee									
Texas Utah									
Vermont									
Virginia									
Washington									
West Virginia									
Wisconsin									
Wyoming									
	31	22	9	24	29	20	20	21	
	2.								

T EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE

South Carolina requires that all new teachers, prior to the start of the school year, be assigned mentors for at least one year. Districts carefully select mentors based on experience and similar certifications and grade levels, and mentors undergo additional training. Adequate release time is mandated by the state so that mentors and new teachers may observe each other in the classroom, collaborate on effective teaching techniques and develop professional growth plans. Mentor evaluations are mandatory and stipends are recommended.

Figure 87

Do states have policies that articulate the elements of effective induction?



 Strong Practice: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia

2. Alaska, Arizona, Florida, Kansas, Montana, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin

3. District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming

Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

Goal B – Professional Development

The state should ensure that teachers receive feedback about their performance and require professional development to be based on needs identified through teacher evaluations.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should require that evaluation systems provide teachers with feedback about their performance.
- 2. The state should require that all teachers who receive a rating of ineffective/ unsatisfactory or needs improvement on their evaluations be placed on an improvement plan.
- 3. The state should direct districts to align professional development activities with findings from teachers' evaluations.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 88

How States are Faring in Professional Development

Best Practice States 2 Louisiana, North Carolina 14 States Meet Goal Arizona¹, Arkansas, Colorado¹, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Maine 1, Michigan, Mississippi¹, New Jersey¹, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia¹, West Virginia¹ States Nearly Meet Goal Illinois, Massachusetts, NEW MEXICO, Utah 13 States Partly Meet Goal Georgia, Hawaii 1, Indiana, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, Wyoming 7 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Alaska, Idaho, Kansas, Maryland, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania¹, South Dakota¹ 11 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, California, District of Columbia, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont, Wisconsin Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:11 👄 : 39 ↓:1
4-B Analysis: New Mexico

State Nearly Meets Goal 🛛 🔶 Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico's Effectiveness Evaluation System requires that all teachers receive a written copy of their annual evaluation. Only teachers rated minimally effective or ineffective are required to have a conference with their evaluator and are placed on an individual professional growth plan. Professional development is tied to evaluation results for all teachers.

Supporting Research NMAC 6.69.8 Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

RECOMMENDATION

Require that evaluation systems provide teachers with feedback about their performance.

Although New Mexico requires teachers to receive copies of their evaluations, this only ensures that teachers will receive their ratings, not necessarily feedback on their performance. New Mexico should specify that all teachers should receive specific feedback on identified strengths and areas that need improvement, not just those teachers rated "minimally effective" or "ineffective."

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Alabama

Do states ensure that evaluations are used to help teachers improve?



EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Louisiana and North Carolina require that teachers receive feedback about their performance from their evaluations and direct districts to connect professional development to teachers' identified needs. Both states also require that teachers with unsatisfactory evaluations are placed on structured improvement plans. These improvement plans include specific performance goals, a description of resources and assistance provided, as well as timelines for improvement.

Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona			
Arkansas			
California			
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
NEW MEXICO			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			2
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin ³			
Wyoming			
	21	21	20
	31	21	29

1. Improvement plans are required for tenured teachers only.

2. Improvement plans are required only for teachers teaching for four years or more.

 Wisconsin's educator effectiveness system includes many of these elements, but is still in the pilot stage. Full implementation will not begin until 2014-2015.

Do teachers receive feedback on their evaluations?



Figure 91

Do states require that teacher evaluations inform professional development?



- Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 2. Alaska, California, Maryland, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania
- Alabama, District of Columbia, Idaho, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, Wisconsin⁴
- Wisconsin's educator effectiveness system requires that teachers receive feedback, but it is still in the pilot stages. Full implementation will not begin until 2014-15.
- Strong Practice: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 2. Alaska, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas
- Alabama, California, District of Columbia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin⁴
- 4. Wisconsin's educator effectiveness system requires that evaluations inform professional development, but it is still in the pilot stages. Full implementation will not begin until 2014-15.

Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

Goal C – Pay Scales

The state should give local districts authority over pay scales.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- While the state may find it appropriate to articulate teachers' starting salaries, it should not require districts to adhere to a statedictated salary schedule that defines steps and lanes and sets minimum pay at each level.
- The state should discourage districts from tying additional compensation to advanced degrees. The state should eliminate salary schedules that establish higher minimum salaries or other requirements to pay more to teachers with advanced degrees.
- 3. The state should discourage salary schedules that imply that teachers with the most experience are the most effective. The state should eliminate salary schedules that require that the highest steps on the pay scale be determined solely be seniority.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 92



4-C Analysis: **New Mexico**



ANALYSIS

New Mexico gives local districts the authority for pay scales, eliminating potential barriers such as state salary schedules and other regulations that control how districts pay teachers. The state mandates a minimum salary but allows districts to determine the remainder of the schedule.

Supporting Research New Mexico Statutes 22-10A-7; 22-10A-10; 22-10A-11

RECOMMENDATION

Discourage districts from tying compensation to advanced degrees.

While still leaving districts the flexibility to establish their own pay scale, New Mexico should articulate policies that definitively discourage districts from tying compensation to advanced degrees, in light of the extensive research showing that such degrees do not have an impact on teacher effectiveness.

Discourage salary schedules that imply that teachers with the most experience are the most effective.

Similarly, New Mexico should articulate policies that discourage districts from determining the highest steps on the pay scale solely by seniority.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Florida and Indiana allow local districts to develop their own salary schedules while preventing districts from prioritizing elements not associated with teacher effectiveness. In Florida, local salary schedules must ensure that the most effective teachers receive salary increases greater than the highest salary adjustment available. Indiana requires local salary scales to be based on a combination of factors and limits the years of teacher experience and content-area degrees to account for no more than one-third of this calculation.

What role does the state	DISTRICTS SET SALARY STUT	State sets minimum sala	Sate ses minimum salary sch
	4RY S	"Sala	salar
play in deciding teacher	T SAL	umun	imun
pay rates?	TS SF.	^{ts} m _{ii}	^{ts} mii
	STRIC	ate se	ate se
	ά /	<u>ح</u> /	S _
Alabama			
Alaska	_		
Arizona Arkansas			
California			
Colorado	1		
Connecticut			
Delaware			
District of Columbia			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
lowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Manland			
Maryland Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
NEW MEXICO			
New York			
North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon	-		
Pennsylvania Rhode Island	2		
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas			
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	27	9	15

DUIE

1. Colorado gives districts the option of a salary schedule, a performance pay policy or a combination of both.

2. Rhode Island requires that local district salary schedules are based on years of service, experience and training.

Figure 94		PROHIBITS ADDITION	Leaves pay to dist.		
De states a revent districts	D COURES PERFORMANC	~~ /	L BAI	Requires compensation for advanced degrees	
Do states prevent districts	RMA	E HA		t disc Ition	
from basing teacher pay on	FRFC	Pol For	fDD, dist-	Dense Besse	
advanced degrees?	NT PER	15 A	1 P	degn degn	
			les pe	Tuires	
	8 Q Q	¥ ð	lea1	Reg	
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey NEW MEXICO					
New York					
North Carolina		1			
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island			2		
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas			3		
Utah	4				
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	3	1	22	15	
	5		32	15	

1. For advanced degrees earned after April 2014.

- 2. Rhode Island requires local district salary schedules to include teacher "training".
- 3. Texas has a minimum salary schedule based on years of experience. Compensation for advanced degrees is left to district discretion.
- 4. Beginning in 2015-2016.

Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

Goal D – Compensation for Prior Work Experience

The state should encourage districts to provide compensation for related prior subject-area work experience.

Goal Component

(The factor considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

1. The state should encourage districts to compensate new teachers with relevant prior work experience through mechanisms such as starting these teachers at an advanced step on the pay scale. Further, the state should not have regulatory language that blocks such strategies.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 95



4-D Analysis: New Mexico

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico does not encourage local districts to provide compensation for related prior subject-area work experience. However, the state does not seem to have regulatory language blocking such strategies.

RECOMMENDATION

Encourage local districts to compensate new teachers with relevant prior work experience.

While still leaving districts with the flexibility to determine their own pay scales, New Mexico should encourage districts to incorporate mechanisms such as starting these teachers at a higher salary than other new teachers. Such policies would be attractive to career changers with related work experience, such as in the STEM subjects.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

T EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE

North Carolina compensates new teachers with relevant prior-work experience by awarding them one year of experience credit for every year of full-time work after earning a bachelor's degree that is related to their area of licensure and work assignment. One year of credit is awarded for every two years of work experience completed prior to earning a bachelor's degree.

Figure 96

Do states direct districts to compensate teachers for related prior work experience?



1. Strong Practice: California, Delaware, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Texas, Washington

2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii³, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming

3. Hawaii's compensation is limited to prior military experience.

Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

Goal E – Differential Pay

The state should support differential pay for effective teaching in shortage and high-need areas.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should support differential pay for effective teaching in shortage subject areas.
- 2. The state should support differential pay for effective teaching in high-need schools.
- 3. The state should not have regulatory language that would block differential pay.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 97

How States are Faring in Differential Pay 1 Best Practice State
Georgia 1 States Meet Goal

Arkansas, California, Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Virginia 🕇

2 States Nearly Meet Goal Maryland, Washington

10 States Partly Meet Goal Colorado, Delaware 1, Hawaii, NEW MEXICO 1, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming

- 8 States Meet a Small Part of Goal Illinois, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont
- **19** States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Rhode Island, West Virginia

Progress on this Goal Since 2011:

1:3 ↔:46 ↓:2

4-E Analysis: **New Mexico**



ANALYSIS

New Mexico supports differential pay by which a teacher can earn additional compensation by teaching certain subjects in a high need-school. The state's STEM teacher initiative provides a \$5,000 stipend per year to 125 highly effective STEM teachers to teach Science, Technology, Engineering or Mathematics (grades 7-12) for two years in a hard-to-staff (low performing (D/F), rural, urban) school.

New Mexico does not offer incentives to teach in high-need schools, other than to those participating in the STEM teach initiative. However, the state has no regulatory language that would directly block districts from providing differential pay.

Supporting Research

RFI STEM Teacher http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/RFPDocs/RFI%20Application2%20for%20stem%20teacher%20initiative.pdf

RECOMMENDATION

Support differential pay initiatives for effective teachers in both subject shortage areas and high-needs schools.

New Mexico should encourage districts to link compensation to district needs. Such policies can help districts achieve a more equitable distribution of teachers.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

New Mexico was helpful in providing NCTQ with the facts necessary for this analysis.

			SUBJECT AREAS	
incentives to teach in high-need schools or shortage subject areas? Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Idaho Conacticut Columbia Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Colorado Connecticut Colorado Connecticut Delaware Colorado Connecticut Colorado Connecticut Colorado Connecticut Colorado Connecticut Colorado Connecticut Colorado Colorado Connecticut Colorado				
high-need schools or shortage subject areas?AlabamaAlabamaAlabamaAlabamaAlabamaAlabamaAlabamaAlabamaAlabamaAlabamaAlabamaAlabamaAlabamaAlabamaAlabamaAlabamaAlabamaAlabamaArkansasColoradoColoradoConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisiana				
AlabamaAlaskaArizonaArizonaArkansasCaliforniaColoradoConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisiana				
AlabamaAlaskaArizonaArizonaArkansasCaliforniaColoradoConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisiana				
AlabamaAlaskaArizonaArizonaArkansasCaliforniaColoradoConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisiana				
AlaskaArizonaArkansasCaliforniaColoradoConnecticutDelawareDistrict of ColumbiaFloridaGeorgiaHawaiiIdahoIllinoisIndianaIowaKansasKentuckyLouisiana				
Arizona Arkansas Arkansas Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Georgia Aawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Iowa Iowa Iowa Iowa Iowa Iowa Iowa Iow				
Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Ilndiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana				
California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Gwa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Iduina Indiana Colorado Co				
Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana				
Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana				
Delaware District of Columbia District of Columbia Georgia Geo				
District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana				
Florida Georgia Georgia Hawaii Galana Georgia				
Georgia Georgia Hawaii Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Giwa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Iowa Giwa Giwa Giwa Giwa Giwa Giwa Giwa Gi				
Hawaii Idaho Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Iowa I				
Idaho I Illinois I Indiana I Iowa I Kansas I Kentucky I Louisiana I				
Illinois Illinois Indiana Indi				
Indiana I Iowa I Kansas I Kentucky I Louisiana I				
lowa C Kansas C Kentucky Louisiana C				
Kansas Kentucky Louisiana				
Kentucky Louisiana				
Louisiana				
Louisiana				
Maryland				
Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi				
Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey				
NEW MEXICO				
New York				
North Carolina				
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma				
Pennsylvania Rhode Island				
South Carolina				2
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia				
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				
Wyoming				
2	27	15	11	20

 Maryland offers tuition reimbursement for teacher retraining in specified shortage subject areas and offers a stipend for alternate route candidates teaching in subject shortage areas.

2. South Dakota offers scholarships to teachers in high-need schools.

T EXAMPLE OF BEST PRACTICE

Georgia supports differential pay by which teachers can earn additional compensation by teaching certain subjects. The state is especially commended for its compensation strategy for math and science teachers, which moves teachers along the salary schedule rather just providing a bonus or stipend. The state also supports differential pay initiatives to link compensation more closely with district needs and to achieve a more equitable distribution of teachers.

Figure 99

Do states support differential pay for teaching in high need schools and shortage subjects?



 Strong Practice: Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Virginia

2. Colorado, Delaware, Hawaii, Maryland, North Carolina, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming

3. Pennsylvania, Utah

^{4.} Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia

Area 4: Retaining Effective Teachers

> Goal F – Performance Pay

The state should support performance pay, but in a manner that recognizes its appropriate uses and limitations.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- 1. The state should support performance pay efforts, rewarding teachers for their effectiveness in the classroom.
- 2. The state should allow districts flexibility to define the criteria for performance pay provided that such criteria connect to evidence of student achievement.
- 3. Any performance pay plan should allow for the participation of all teachers, not just those in tested subjects and grades.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 100

How States are Faring in Performance Pay **Best Practice States** 2 Florida. Indiana **16** States Meet Goal Arizona, Arkansas, Georgia, Hawaii1, Louisiana¹, Maine¹, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi¹, New York¹, Ohio¹, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah State Nearly Meets Goal California 5 States Partly Meet Goal Kentucky, Missouri, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia State Meets a Small Part of Goal Nebraska 26 States Do Not Meet Goal Alabama, Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Idaho4, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, NEW MEXICO, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming Progress on this Goal Since 2011: **⇒**:42 4:3 1:6

4-F Analysis: New Mexico

Progress Since 2011 State Does Not Meet Goal

ANALYSIS

New Mexico does not support performance pay. The state does not have any policies in place that offer teachers additional compensation based on evidence of effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATION

Support a performance pay plan that recognizes teachers for their effectiveness.

Whether it implements the plan at the state or local level, New Mexico should ensure that performance pay structures thoughtfully measure classroom performance and connect student achievement to teacher effectiveness. The plan must be developed with careful consideration of available data and subsequent issues of fairness.

Consider piloting performance pay in a select number of school districts.

This would provide an opportunity to discover and correct any limitations in available data or methodology before implementing the plan on a wider scale.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Figure 101	PERFORMANCE FACTORED	PERFORMANCE BONUSES	S&	State supported performance	ance
Destation		E W SE	Performance pay permiting.	State supported performance	- Ustrics or revel in mar Does not suppor Performance pay
Do states support	LO LE	EBO.	av pe		schere
performance pay?	ARY	10 V	1 pri	pon ivec	it cfs of
	LES CE	ABLE	^{ra} ge	te-su intiat	uistr, not man
	PER DE	AVAII AVAII	Perfe	Sta Sta felect	Does not support
Alabama			, ,	/ ~	
Alaska					
Arizona					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine					
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska		1			
Nevada			2		
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
NEW MEXICO					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah Vermont					
Virginia Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
ttyoning					
	6	2	8	9	26

EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

An increasing number of states are supporting performance pay initiatives. Florida and Indiana are particularly noteworthy for their efforts to build performance into the salary schedule. Rather than award bonuses, teachers' salaries will be based in part on their performance in the classroom.

1. Nebraska's initiative does not go into effect until 2016.

2. Nevada's initiative does not go into effect until 2015-2016.

Area 5 Summary



How States are Faring in Exiting Ineffective Teachers

State Area Grades



Topics Included In This Area

- 5-A: Extended Emergency Licenses
- 5-B: Dismissal for Poor Performance
- 5-C: Reductions in Force

Area 5: Exiting Ineffective Teachers

Goal A – Extended Emergency Licenses

The state should close loopholes that allow teachers who have not met licensure requirements to continue teaching.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- Under no circumstances should a state award a standard license to a teacher who has not passed all required subject-matter licensing tests.
- 2. If a state finds it necessary to confer conditional or provisional licenses under limited and exceptional circumstances to teachers who have not passed the required tests, the state should ensure that requirements are met within one year.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 102

How States are Faring in Licensure Loopholes

Best Practice States 4 Colorado, Illinois, Mississippi, New Jersey 3 States Meet Goal Nevada, NEW MEXICO, South Carolina 14 States Nearly Meet Goal Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Georgia, Iowa 1, Kentucky, Massachusetts, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Utah, West Virginia 2 States Partly Meet Goal New York, Wyoming States Meet a Small Part of Goal 2 Michigan, Vermont 26 States Do Not Meet Goal Alaska, Arizona, California, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin Progress on this Goal Since 2011: 1:1 👄 : 50 4:0

5-A Analysis: **New Mexico**



Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

New Mexico requires that only teachers who have met all state requirements may teach in core academic areas. Core academic subjects are defined as "English, language arts, reading, mathematics, science, modern and classical languages, except the modern and classical Native American languages and cultures of New Mexico tribes or pueblos, the arts, including music and visual arts, and social studies, which includes civics, government, economics, history, and geography."

However, the state does allow teachers in other areas to teach under endorsement waivers, provided evidence is presented of emergency circumstances.

Supporting Research New Mexico Administrative Code 6.61.9

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Figure 103		/	/	/	Ð
How long can new teachers practice without passing licensing tests?	NO DEFERRAL	Up to ₁ Jear	Up to 2 Jears	Jears or more for ungere.	
	< ,			رب 	
Alabama Alaska					
Alaska					
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho					
Illinois					
Indiana					
lowa					
Kansas					
Kentucky					
Louisiana					
Maine Mandan d					
Maryland Massachusetts					
Michigan					
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri					
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
NEW MEXICO					
New York					
North Carolina					
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
	7	14	8	22	



Do states still award emergency licenses?



- 1. Strong Practice: Alaska⁴, Colorado, Illinois, Mississippi, Montana⁵, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, South Carolina
- 2. Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota⁶, Ohio⁶, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island⁶, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 3. Arizona, Hawaii, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Wisconsin
- 4. Alaska does not require subject-matter testing for initial certification.
- 5. Montana does not require subject-matter testing for certification.
- 6. License is renewable, but only if licensure tests are passed.

Area 5: Exiting Ineffective Teachers

Goal B – Dismissal for Poor Performance

The state should articulate that ineffective classroom performance is grounds for dismissal and ensure that the process for terminating ineffective teachers is expedient and fair to all parties.

Goal Components

(The factors considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

- The state should articulate that teachers may be dismissed for ineffective classroom performance. Any teacher that receives two consecutive ineffective evaluations or two such ratings within five years should be formally eligible for dismissal, regardless of tenure status.
- 2. A teacher who is terminated for poor performance should have an opportunity to appeal. In the interest of both the teacher and the school district, the state should ensure that this appeal occurs within a reasonable time frame.
- 3. There should be a clear distinction between the process and accompanying due process rights for teachers dismissed for classroom ineffectiveness and the process and accompanying due process rights for teachers dismissed or facing license revocation for felony or morality violations or dereliction of duties.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy



5-B Analysis: **New Mexico**



ANALYSIS

New legislation in New Mexico requires that nonprobationary employees rated minimally effective or ineffective on performance evaluations be placed on a 90-day performance growth plan. If, after the 90 days, the teacher has not made progress, "the local superintendent shall determine whether to discharge or terminate the employee."

New Mexico does not distinguish the due process rights of teachers dismissed for ineffective performance from those facing other charges commonly associated with license revocation, such as a felony and/or morality violations. The process is the same regardless of the grounds for cancellation, which the state articulates vaguely as "just cause."

Tenured teachers who are terminated have multiple opportunities to appeal. After receiving written notice of dismissal, the teacher has five days to request a hearing. The local superintendent then has five days to provide written reasons for the notice of termination, and the teacher has 10 days to respond. Within 15 days, the board must conduct a hearing, and it has another five days to issue a decision. The aggrieved teacher may appeal to an arbitrator within five days of receipt of the decision. The appeal hearing must be held within 30 days, and the decision rendered is final. There is no time frame specified for issuing the appeal.

Supporting Research N.M.A.C. 6.69.8.11 New Mexico Code 22-10A-24, -25

RECOMMENDATION

Ensure that teachers terminated for poor performance have the opportunity to appeal within a reasonable time frame.

Nonprobationary teachers who are dismissed for any grounds, including ineffectiveness, are entitled to due process. New Mexico should articulate policy that provides nonprobationary teachers an opportunity to appeal district decisions to terminate their contracts. However, cases that drag on for years drain resources from school districts and create a disincentive for districts to attempt to terminate poor performers. Therefore, the state must ensure that the opportunity to appeal occurs only once and only at the district level. It is in the best interest of both the teacher and the district that a conclusion is reached within a reasonable time frame.

Distinguish the process and accompanying due process rights between dismissal for classroom ineffectiveness and dismissal for morality violations, felonies or dereliction of duty.

While nonprobationary teachers should have due process for any termination, it is important to differentiate between loss of employment and issues with far-reaching consequences that could permanently affect a teacher's right to practice. New Mexico should ensure that appeals related to classroom effectiveness are decided only by those with educational expertise.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Figure 106		No North Contraction
Do states articulate that	SA42	Sha
ineffectiveness is grounds	ĨO H	NE NO
for dismissal?	PUL FLA	. .
jor clomissur	VES THI	28
Alabama	▼	
Alaska		
Arizona		
Arkansas		
California		
Colorado		
Connecticut		
Delaware		
District of Columbia		
Florida		
Georgia		
Hawaii		
Idaho		
Illinois		
Indiana		
lowa		
Kansas		
Kentucky		
Louisiana		
Maine		
Maryland		
Massachusetts		
Michigan		
Minnesota		
Mississippi Missouri		
Montana		
Nebraska		
Nevada		1
New Hampshire		
New Jersey		
NEW MEXICO		
New York		
North Carolina		
North Dakota		
Ohio		
Oklahoma		
Oregon		
Pennsylvania		
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
South Dakota		
Tennessee		
Texas		
Utah		
Vermont		
Virginia		
Washington		
West Virginia		
Wisconsin		
Wyoming		
	29	22

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Florida and Oklahoma clearly articulate that teacher ineffectiveness in the classroom is grounds for dismissal. In both states, teachers are eligible for dismissal after two annual ratings of unsatisfactory performance. Each state has taken steps to ensure that the dismissal process for teachers deemed to be ineffective is expedited. Teachers facing dismissal have only one opportunity to appeal.

1. A teacher reverts to probationary status after two consecutive years of unsatisfactory evaluations, but it is not articulated that ineffectiveness is grounds for dismissal.

Do states allow multiple appeals of teacher dismissals?



1. Strong Practice: Florida, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Wisconsin

- 2. Teachers in these states revert to probationary status following ineffective evaluation ratings, meaning that they no longer have the due process right to multiple appeals: Colorado, Indiana, Tennessee
- 3. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
- 4. District of Columbia, Maine, Nebraska, Nevada⁵, Utah, Vermont
- Though a teacher returns to probationary status after two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations, Nevada does not articulate clear policy about its appeals process.

Area 5: Exiting Ineffective Teachers

Goal C – Reductions in Force

The state should require that its school districts consider classroom performance as a factor in determining which teachers are laid off when a reduction in force is necessary.

Goal Component

(The factor considered in determining the states' rating for the goal.)

1. The state should require that districts consider classroom performance and ensure that seniority is not the only factor used to determine which teachers are laid off.

Background

A detailed rationale and supporting research for this goal can be found at: nctq.org/statepolicy

Figure 108



5-C Analysis: New Mexico

State Does Not Meet Goal

Progress Since 2011

ANALYSIS

In New Mexico, the factors used by districts to determine which teachers are laid off during a reduction in force are decided at the district level.

Supporting Research New Mexico Code 6.67.3.8

RECOMMENDATION

Require that districts consider classroom performance as a factor in determining which teachers are laid off during reductions in force.

New Mexico can still leave districts flexibility in determining layoff policies, but it should do so within a framework that ensures that classroom performance is considered.

Ensure that seniority is not the only factor used to determine which teachers are laid off. Unlike some states, New Mexico does not require that districts consider seniority; however, the state should do more to prevent districts from making decisions solely on this basis.

NEW MEXICO RESPONSE TO ANALYSIS

Do states prevent districts from basing layoffs solely on "last in, first out"?

J THE ONLY FACTOR BE PERFORMANCE MUST Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware \square District of Columbia Florida Georgia Hawaii \square \square Idaho \square Illinois Indiana lowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota \square Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey **NEW MEXICO** \square \square New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Carolina \square South Dakota Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virginia Washington West Virginia

18

22

Wisconsin

Wyoming

Figure 109

Do districts have to consider performance in determining which teachers are laid off?



1. Strong Practice: Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts³, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio³, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington

- 2. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
- 3. Tenure is considered first.

T EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICE

Colorado, **Florida**, and **Indiana** all specify that in determining which teachers to lay off during a reduction in force, classroom performance is the top criterion. These states also articulate that seniority can only be considered after a teacher's performance is taken into account.

Figure 111

Do states prevent districts from overemphasizing seniority in layoff decisions?



 Strong Practice: Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts⁶, Michigan, Missouri⁶, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio⁶, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington

- 3. Hawaii, Minnesota, New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Wisconsin⁷
- 4. California, Kentucky, New Jersey, Oregon
- 5. Alabama, Alaska⁶, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska⁶, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming
- 6. Nontenured teachers are laid off first.
- 7. Only for counties with populations of 500,000 or more and for teachers hired before 1995.

^{2.} Strong Practice: Louisiana, Utah

Goals and Keywords

GOAL	STATEMENT	KEY WORDS
	AREA 1: Delivering Well Prepared Te	achers
1-A: Admission into Teacher Preparation	The state should require teacher preparation programs to admit only candidates with strong academic records.	admission requirements, academic proficiency measures, basic skills tests, GPA
1-B: Elementary Teacher Preparation	The state should ensure that its teacher preparation programs provide elementary teachers with a broad liberal arts education, providing the necessary foundation for teaching to the Common Core or similar state standards.	license/certification, elementary teachers, early childhood teachers, content tests, elementary coursework/standards, content specialization requirements
1-C: Elementary Teacher Preparation in Reading Instruction	The state should ensure that new elementary teachers know the science of reading instruction.	license/certification, elementary teachers, early childhood teachers, science of reading tests, science of reading coursework/standards
1-D: Elementary Teacher Preparation in Mathematics	The state should ensure that new elementary teachers have sufficient knowledge of the mathematics content taught in elementary grades.	license/certification, elementary teachers, early childhood teachers, math content tests, math coursework/standards
1-E: Middle School Teacher Preparation	The state should ensure that middle school teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.	license/certification, middle school teachers, content tests, K-8 licenses, content specialization requirements
1-F: Secondary Teacher Preparation	The state should ensure that secondary teachers are sufficiently prepared to teach appropriate grade-level content.	license/certification, secondary teachers, secondary social studies, content tests, endorsements
1-G: Secondary Teacher Preparation in Science	The state should ensure that secondary science teachers know all the subject matter they are licensed to teach.	license/certification, secondary general science, content tests, combination sciences
1-H: Special Education Teacher Preparation	The state should ensure that special education teachers know the subject matter they are licensed to teach.	license/certification, special education teachers, content tests, K-12 special education license, elementary special education, secondary special education
1-I: Assessing Professional Knowledge	The state should use a licensing test to verify that all new teachers meet its professional standards.	license/certification, pedagogy, professional standards/knowledge, performance assessments, edTPA
1-J: Student Teaching	The state should ensure that teacher preparation programs provide teacher candidates with a high quality clinical experience.	student teaching, cooperating teachers, clinical preparation, placements
1-K: Teacher Preparation Program Accountability	The state's approval process for teacher preparation programs should hold programs accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce.	teacher preparation programs, program accountability, student achievement, standard of performance, public reporting, national accreditation

Goals and Keywords

GOAL	STATEMENT	KEY WORDS
	AREA 2: Expanding the Teaching I	Pool
2-A: Alternate Route Eligibility	The state should require alternate route programs to exceed the admission requirements of traditional preparation programs while also being flexible to the needs of nontraditional candidates.	alternate route programs, admission requirements, GPA, academic proficiency measures, subject-matter test, flexibility/ test-out
2-B: Alternate Route Preparation	The state should ensure that its alternate routes provide efficient preparation that is relevant to the immediate needs of new teachers, as well as adequate mentoring and support.	alternate route programs, coursework requirements, length of program, student/ practice teaching, induction, mentoring
2-C: Alternate Route Usage and Providers	The state should provide an alternate route that is free from limitations on its usage and allows a diversity of providers.	alternate routes; subject, grade or geographic restrictions; college or university providers; district-run programs; non-profit providers
2-D: Part-Time Teaching Licenses	The state should offer a license with minimal requirements that allows content experts to teach part time.	part-time license/certificate, adjunct license
2-E: Licensure Reciprocity	The state should help to make licenses fully portable among states, with appropriate safeguards.	license reciprocity, license portability, out-of-state teachers, testing requirements, online teachers
	AREA 3: Identifying Effective Teac	hers
3-A: State Data Systems	The state should have a data system that contributes some of the evidence needed to assess teacher effectiveness.	longitudinal data systems, definition of teacher of record, teacher production
3-B: Evaluation of Effectiveness	The state should require instructional effectiveness to be the preponderant criterion of any teacher evaluation.	teacher evaluation, teacher effectiveness, student learning, classroom observations, surveys, rating categories
3-C: Frequency of Evaluations	The state should require annual evaluations of all teachers.	teacher evaluation, evaluation frequency, classroom observations, feedback
3-D: Tenure	The state should require that tenure decisions are based on evidence of teacher effectiveness.	tenure, probationary period, continuing contracts, teacher effectiveness
3-E: Licensure Advancement	The state should base licensure advancement on evidence of teacher effectiveness.	probationary license, professional license, license renewal, evidence of teacher effectiveness, coursework requirements
3-F: Equitable Distribution	The state should publicly report districts' distribution of teacher talent among schools to identify inequities in schools serving disadvantaged children.	public reporting, aggregate school-level data, evaluation ratings, school report cards, teacher absenteeism rate, turnover rate

Goals and Keywords

GOAL	STATEMENT	KEY WORDS
	AREA 4: Retaining Effective Teach	ners
4-A: Induction	The state should require effective induction for all new teachers, with special emphasis on teachers in high-need schools.	mentoring, induction, mentor selection, reduced teaching load, release time
4-B: Professional Development	The state should ensure that teachers receive feedback about their performance and should require professional development to be based on needs identified through teacher evaluations.	feedback from observations/evaluations, professional development linked to evaluations results, improvement plans
4-C: Pay Scales	The state should give local districts authority over pay scales.	teacher compensation, salary schedules, pay scales, steps and lanes, advanced degrees, years of experience, teacher performance
4-D: Compensation for Prior Work Experience	The state should encourage districts to provide compensation for related prior subject-area work experience.	teacher compensation, relevant work experience
4-E: Differential Pay	The state should support differential pay for effective teaching in shortage and high-need areas.	teacher compensation, differential pay, shortage subject areas, high-need schools
4-F: Performance Pay	The state should support performance pay, but in a manner that recognizes its appropriate uses and limitations.	teacher compensation, performance pay, teacher performance, student achievement
	AREA 5: Exiting Ineffective Teach	ners
5-A: Extended Emergency Licenses	The state should close loopholes that allow teachers who have not met licensure requirements to continue teaching.	emergency licenses, provisional certificates, loopholes, subject-matter tests
5-B: Dismissal for Poor Performance	The state should articulate that ineffective classroom performance is grounds for dismissal and ensure that the process for terminating ineffective teachers is expedient and fair to all parties.	dismissal, ineffectiveness, poor performance, appeals, due process
5-C: Reductions in Force	The state should require that its school districts consider classroom performance as a factor in determining which teachers are laid off when a reduction in force is necessary.	reduction in force, layoffs, teacher performance, seniority

Teacher Policy Priorities for New Mexico

AREA 1: Delivering Well Prepared Teachers	
Require that teacher preparation programs screen candidates prior to admission by using a common test normed to the general college-bound population, and limit acceptance to those candidates demonstrating academic ability in the top 50th percentile.	Goal 1-A
Adopt an elementary content test with independently scored subject-matter subtests in each of the core areas.	Goal 1-B
Require a rigorous stand-alone math test for all elementary teacher candidates.	Goal 1-D
Eliminate the generalist K-8 license, and require all middle school teacher candidates to pass a content test in every core area they are licensed to teach.	Goal 1-E
Specifically require secondary social studies and science teachers to pass a content test for each discipline they are licensed to teach.	Goal 1-F Goal 1-G
Eliminate the K-12 special education certificate, and ensure that both elementary and secondary special education teachers possess adequate and appropriate content knowledge for the grades and subjects they teach.	Goal 1-H
Ensure that cooperating teachers for student teaching placements have demonstrated evidence of effectiveness as measured by student learning, and require teacher candidates to spend at least 10 weeks student teaching.	Goal 1-J
Hold teacher preparation programs accountable by collecting data that connect student achievement gains to programs, as well as other meaningful data that reflect program performance, and by establishing the minimum standard of performance for each category of data.	Goal 1-K
AREA 2: Expanding the Teaching Pool	
Articulate admission requirements for alternate route programs, including a high bar for academic proficiency and passage of a subject-matter test.	Goal 2-A
Establish guidelines for alternate route programs that require preparation that meets the immediate needs of new teachers. Ensure programs provide intensive induction support to alternate route teachers.	Goal 2-B
Allow a diversity of providers for alternate route programs.	Goal 2-C
Require out-of-state teachers to meet the state's own testing requirements.	Goal 2-E

	10.85
AREA 3: Identifying Effective Teachers	
Ensure that evidence of effectiveness is the preponderant criterion in tenure decisions.	Goal 3-I
Base licensure advancement from a probationary to a nonprobationary license and licensure renewal on evidence of effectiveness.	Goal 3-I
Publish aggregate school-level teacher evaluation ratings from an evaluation system based on instructional effectiveness.	Goal 3-I
AREA 4: Retaining Effective Teachers	
Require effective induction for all new teachers, including reduced teaching load, frequent release time to observe effective teachers and seminars appropriate to grade level or subject area.	Goal 4-A
Discourage districts from basing teacher pay scales primarily on advanced degrees and seniority.	Goal 4-0
Support performance pay to recognize teachers for their effectiveness.	Goal 4-I
AREA 5: Exiting Ineffective Teachers	
Make ineffective classroom performance grounds for dismissal.	Goal 5-I
Use teacher effectiveness as a factor when determining which teachers are laid off during a reduction in force.	Goal 5-0
	13567
	Base licensure advancement from a probationary to a nonprobationary license and licensure renewal on evidence of effectiveness. Publish aggregate school-level teacher evaluation ratings from an evaluation system based on instructional effectiveness. Require effective induction for all new teachers, including reduced teaching load, frequent release time to observe effective teachers and seminars appropriate to grade level or subject area. Discourage districts from basing teacher pay scales primarily on advanced degrees and seniority. Support performance pay to recognize teachers for their effectiveness. Make ineffective classroom performance grounds for dismissal. Use teacher effectiveness as a factor when determining which teachers are laid off during a



1120 G Street, NW • Washington, DC 20005 Tel: 202-393-0020 Fax: 202-393-0095 Web: www.nctq.org

Subscribe to NCTQ's blog PDQ Solow NCTQ on Twitter 🕒 and Facebook 📑

NCTQ is available to work with individual states to improve teacher policies. For more information, please contact:

> Sandi Jacobs Vice President sjacobs@nctq.org 202-393-0020